

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 152

EC 152 597

AUTHOR Reynolds, Maynard C., Ed.
TITLE The Future of Mainstreaming: Next Steps in Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. National Support Systems Project.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-86586-145-5
PUB DATE 82
GRANT OEG007902045
NOTE 91p.; Papers presented at the annual meeting of the Dean's Grant Projects (7th, Bloomington, MN, April 28-30, 1982).
AVAILABLE FROM The Council for Exceptional Children, Publication Sales, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091 (Publication No. 267; \$8.50, \$7.23 member price; contact CEC for discount on quantity orders).
PUB TYPE Books (010) -- Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Foundations of Education; *Mainstreaming; Mild Disabilities; Peer Acceptance; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Deans Grant Project

ABSTRACT

Eight papers from a 1982 meeting of the Dean's Grant Projects examine issues related to the current status and future needs of mainstreaming handicapped students. M. Reynolds begins with "Facing the Future in Dean's Grant Projects," in which he examines the progress of Dean's Grants and suggests that the future will bring problems regarding classifications, changing social situations, and related services. In "The 1980s: Teacher Preparation Programs, Handicapped Children, and the Courts," T. Gilhool recaps relevant litigation concerning state of the art vs. state of the practice. R. Johnson and D. Johnson suggest ways to promote constructive student-student interaction in "The Social Structure of School Classrooms." "Foundations Aspects of Teacher-Education Programs: A Look to the Future" by C. Lucas suggests the need for major reforms in the role of educational foundations courses. In "A Time to Move for Quality in Teacher Education," D. Scannell identifies reasons for the need to initiate a major effort for excellence in teacher education. S. Lilly considers issues in mainstreaming in "The Education of Mildly Handicapped Children and Implications for Teacher Education," including the need to prepare special educators as well as regular educators. E. Sontag addresses the issues of relationships between special and regular education, the quality of educational programs, and the future of regular education preservice in his paper, "Perspectives on the Status and Future of Special Education and Regular Education." A. E. Blackhurst describes efforts at the University of Kentucky in "Noncategorical Special Education Teacher Preparation," and lists such benefits as better prepared teachers and reduced stereotyping. (CL)

ED231152

The Future of Mainstreaming: Next Steps in Teacher Education

Editor
Maynard C. Reynolds

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

A publication of the National Support Systems Project at the University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, under a grant from the Special Education Programs, Office of Special
Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education.

EC152597

This project was performed pursuant to Grant No. OEG007902045 from Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U. S. Department of Education. The points of view expressed herein are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

Minneapolis, Minnesota

1982

Copies may be ordered from The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091. Contact CEC Publication Sales Unit for current single copy price and for quantity order discount rates.

Preface

The seventh annual meeting of the Dean's Grant Projects and the last called by the National Support Systems Project was held in Bloomington, Minnesota (a suburb of Minneapolis), on April 28-30, 1982. The 730 participants included deans of colleges/schools/departments of education, project personnel, members of education faculties, advocates for handicapped children, representatives of the U.S. Department of Education, guests, and NSSP staff members.

The first seven papers of this collection were initially developed for oral presentation at the meeting and were there taped. Subsequently, they were edited and, in some cases, re-written for publication in this volume. The last paper, by Blackhurst, was presented earlier at a joint meeting of the South and Southeast Regions of Dean's Grant Projects, which was held in Atlanta, Georgia, on April 19-20. Because its theme is particularly relevant to the future orientation of the annual meeting, the paper is included here.

The success of any large meeting or conference depends in large part upon the arrangements. NSSP has been very fortunate, throughout its history, to be able to depend upon the Assistant to the Director, Ms. Karen Lundholm, to facilitate the housing, meetings, and exhibits of participants. More important, throughout her association with NSSP she has carried its day-to-day operations as well as many of the difficulties encountered by DGPs.

I also want to thank Ms. Bonnie Warhol and K. Charles Lakin for their generous assistance in making the annual meeting a success. Bonnie also prepared the camera-ready copy for this publication. At the same time, I want to express my appreciation to the Regional Liaisons for the Dean's Grant Projects who helped to arrange the program and to recommend presenters for the meeting.

Sylvia W. Rosen was the Publications Editor for this publication and for others of the large list of NSSP publications. Her expert help and good spirit through many days of editing and printing are gratefully acknowledged.

Maynard C. Reynolds

University of Minnesota

CONTENTS

Preface.	iii
Maynard C. Reynolds. . . <u>Facing the Future in Dean's Grant Projects.</u>	1
Thomas K. Gilhool. . . <u>The 1980s: Teacher Preparation Programs, Handicapped Children, and the Courts.</u>	15
Roger Johnson & David Johnson. . . <u>The Social Structure of School Classrooms.</u>	26
Christopher J. Lucas. . . <u>Foundational Aspects of Teacher-Education Programs: A Look to the Future.</u>	32
Dale P. Scannell. . . <u>A Time to Move for Quality in Teacher Education.</u> . .	45
Steven Lilly. . . <u>The Education of Mildly Handicapped Children and Implications for Teacher Education</u>	52
Edward Schrag. . . <u>Perspectives on the Status and Future of Special Education and Regular Education</u>	65
A. Edward Blackhurst. . . <u>Noncategorical Special Education Teacher Education.</u>	74

Facing the Future in Dean's Grant Projects

Maynard C. Reynolds, Director
National Support Systems Project
University of Minnesota

Seven Years of Growth

The national meeting of Dean's Grant Projects (DGPs) reported in this publication was held from April 28 to 30, 1982, in Bloomington, Minnesota. It was the last such meeting arranged by the National Support Systems Project (NSSP), the organization that had provided technical assistance to DGPs since they came into existence. Although DGPs will continue to be funded by Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education, NSSP itself will close up shop as of September 30, 1982. Despite this circumstance, which inevitably influenced some of the proceedings, the conference was not a wake; it had, rather, some overtones of process evaluation within the context of planning for the future.

The first national meeting of DGPs was also held in Bloomington, seven years ago, July 1975, a few months before Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, was signed into law by then-President Ford. The Dean's Grant program had been initiated in 1974 by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (U.S. Office of Education) and 59 projects had been funded for the year 1975-76. Representing the 59 projects in 1975 were 112 delegates to the national meeting: deans, special educators, and regular educators, all involved in teacher preparation. The host institutions were located in 31 states, the District of Columbia, and the Territory of American Samoa. Currently (Spring 1982), 127 DGPs are funded in the program; they are located in 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

It is fitting that the leadership of Edwin Martin, the Deputy Commissioner of Education and Director of BEH at the time the Dean's Grant Program

^a Also, Professor of Special Education, Department of Psychoeducational Studies, College of Education.

was started, be acknowledged for developing the program. As I recall, the idea for Dean's Grant Projects was generated by Martin and a group of deans of education who had been linked to projects at the University of Nebraska and University of North Dakota. We owe to them and Thomas Behrens, the first project officer for DGPs, a considerable debt for recognizing and acting on the broad responsibilities of teacher-education institutions toward handicapped students and the nation's public schools.¹ I remember a talk by Martin during that period in which he discussed the "dichotomous relations between regular and special education"; he predicted that educators soon would have to renegotiate (a term which has since become a favorite of mine) those relations, that they would have to find ways to come back together again. He saw the Dean's Grant program as one avenue for the necessary renegotiation.

We were frankly uncertain in 1975 about whether DGPs would work. In a way we were like those early European explorers who set out for terra incognita: We weren't sure where we were going, if we would get there, what path to follow, and even, whether we had the right vehicle for the trip. About all we had in our favor was a strong general acceptance of the fact that the time had come to up-date the preparation of regular classroom teachers, taking into account the needs of handicapped students.

In planning that first national meeting, we knew that it would have to be broad in its appeal, that the presentations would have to make as much sense to regular educators as they did to special educators. The purpose of the meeting, after all, was not to "sell" special education but, rather, to open both kinds of education to a new concept of delivering educational services to children who were often neglected by the schools. We were fortunate in our choice of speakers.²

The first address at the 1975 meeting (after Martin's introductory remarks) was given by Tom Gilhool. He had been the attorney for the plaintiffs in the *PAAC* case in 1971-72 from which there emerged distinctly, for the first time, the principles of the right to education, education that is appropriate to the individual, parental right to participate in educational planning for their children, the application of the least restrictive alternative in the placement of children, and due process. To me, the concept of least restrictive alternative was never made so clear as in the consent agreement which

¹ I wish to express appreciation to George Hagerty who succeeded Tom Behrens as project officer for the DGPs and to Edward Sontag who heads Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education, at the time of this writing. Both have contributed greatly to the Dean's Grant Projects in many ways. See Sontag's paper in this volume.

² The major presenters (and discussants) were Edwin Martin; Thomas K. Gilhool (Geraldine J. Clifford, Dan C. Lortie, Jeanne B. Frein, Leslie Brinegar, and Robert Egbert); Richard E. Snow (Herbert Klausmeier, Charles Meisgeier, and Asa G. Hillard III); Rue Cromwell (Dean Corrigan, Richard A. Johnson, and Reginald L. Jones); Henry J. Bertness; and Michael Scriven.

Gilhool negotiated with the Secretary of Education in Pennsylvania in 1971. I particularly remember Gilhool's saying during our meeting that what started in the PARC case on behalf of retarded children was but an opener for individualizing educational programs for all children. He is, I believe, one of those particularly foresightful attorneys who recognized long before many of us the import of the principles embodied in PARC and eventually in Public Law 94-142.

Those of you who were at that meeting seven years ago may remember the address given by Geraldine Clifford, an historian from the University of California at Berkeley, in response to Gilhool's paper. In summarizing the ways schools in our nation have tried to accommodate pupil populations with special needs over the two centuries, she stressed the fact that changes have never been linear; that is, they never have followed a straight line from recognition of the problem to general adoption of a solution. She gave many examples of the torturous path taken by schools in becoming more inclusive of children who did not fit the normal stereotype. Expectations for the implementation of what became Public Law 94-142, she thought, might well include setbacks and much complexity.

Prof. Klausmeier, of the University of Wisconsin, explained the IGE (Individually Guided Education) program, a broad educational delivery system devised to take account of children's individual differences. Prof. Richard Snow, of Stanford University, reported on the state of the art of individualizing instruction at that time. Working with Lee Cronbach, Snow had helped to restore meaning to the concept of aptitude as related to the adaptation of instruction to the individual, and he told us of these emerging ideas.

Examining the ethics and logic of mainstreaming, Prof. Michael Scriven raised the question of trade-offs: When one child is excluded from a regular classroom because of a difference, are the possible catastrophic effects upon that child worth what may be only marginal gains for the rest of the class? Many educators are still wrestling with this question. To face it is to recognize the moral and ethical dimensions of child classification and placement issues.

Despite our uncertainties, we were right to take a rather broad approach to the Dean's Grant Projects rather than a sharply limited perspective. The concept of the least restrictive alternative, a major principle of Public Law 94-142, is so basic to the future of education that it calls for important changes in teacher preparation. As you know, this principle mandates that every handicapped child be provided with instruction in a setting that is the closest to normal (i.e., regular classroom or part-time resource room instead of special setting; community residences instead of institutions) in which he or she can function successfully rather than to move the child to an isolated environment.

We have made much progress over the past seven years in the Dean's Grant Projects, especially in building awareness among teacher-education faculties

of the rights and needs of special children. In addition, we have helped to chart the "journey" to be made in reconstructing curriculums for teacher preparation.

Difficulties We Face in the Future

All is not smooth sailing, however. New uncertainties have appeared in many colleges and universities, including fiscal retrenchment and personnel cutbacks. Teacher-education units have been affected more deeply than other units in many institutions and the despair felt by some faculty members has itself become a source of great concern.

The "new federalism," which proposes the devolution of the federal role in many categorical education programs back to state and local agencies, also raises complications, especially when accompanied by budgetary recisions. The Department of Education budget for the Dean's Grant program was cut substantially for 1982-83.³ Many other programs were reduced in similar amounts. Perhaps there will be a reversal of that negative trend, but it is hard to be optimistic about it, at least in the short range. What will happen if leadership in school affairs becomes increasingly a state and local matter and less a concern for the federal government? The schools have been quite responsive to the messages from the Congress and federal administration on the intent of Public Law 94-142, but if the federal government exhibits a declining interest in this area, whose voice will rise and be heard by the local leadership? Geraldine Clifford was surely correct in anticipating less than a linear record of progress in bringing handicapped children into the mainstream.

Another difficulty, one of rising concern, at least since the mid-1960s, is the general aura of distrust which has surrounded the public schools and the institutions providing teacher education. There is some anxiety over the numbers of private schools; they are growing at alarming rates in some parts of the nation and may overtake the public schools generally. If the advocates of voucher systems or tax breaks for parents who pay private school tuition have their way and the middle class deserts the public schools, then the public schools very well may be left mainly with the mission of serving those children who are not acceptable to the private schools.

The loss of public confidence in education is reflected specifically and strongly in the doubts expressed about teachers and teacher education. At least 18 states recently launched special testing programs to limit candidates for teaching; such moves have been described as simply "the opening gun in a broader effort to reform teacher education institutions and programs" (Vlaanderen, 1982, p. 20). Gene Lyons (1980), in an award-winning article, described teacher education as "a massive fraud. It drives out dedicated people, rewards incompetence, and wastes millions of dollars" (p. 108). Such expressions, coming at a time of severe financial cutbacks in education, can be

³ The first cut was 48.5% from each grant; in late September 1982, after a supplemental appropriation by the Congress, about two-thirds of the cut was restored.

cause for despair or special challenge. Those of us who are involved in the Dean's Grant Projects perhaps have more reason than most to accept the criticism as a challenge.

John Brandl, a professor at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota, has noted that institutional retrenchment can occur only to a limited extent; then you reach a kind of threshold point at which the organization cannot tolerate any more simple retrenchment so you have to start restructuring it. We may have reached that point in many of our colleges and universities and especially in our teacher-training programs. The soft spots have been eliminated and we are down to the bare bones where, if any additional changes are made in resources and funding, we shall have to rearrange the way those bones are put together.

Critical Problems and Issues

In the remainder of this paper I discuss several topics that appear to me to be of critical importance for the future attempts to implement Public Law 94-142. My focus is mainly on teacher preparation, but problems and changes in the elementary and secondary schools also are considered, to the extent that they portend important changes in teacher preparation. The 1982 Dean's Grant Conference, which was introduced by these remarks, included a number of presentations that extended the particular topics touched upon in the following subsections.

The DGPs Should Deal with "Fundamentals"

Whenever major changes are called for in social programs and institutions the danger arises that the response will be expedient make-dos rather than fundamental changes. The schools of the nation have been rife with after-school workshops instructing teachers how to comply with Public Law 94-142, as if the problem were simply to fill out forms, to get parents' signatures, to satisfy the minimum procedural standards demanded by government monitors, and to "stay out of jail." But this kind of mechanical compliance, which is designed to meet the bare letter of the law, is not enough.

College and university personnel have a particular obligation to recognize that settling for the expedients, avoiding fundamental issues, and failing to identify new directions in public policy are wasteful and say a great deal about us. Those of us who staff the colleges are one step removed from the legal imperatives facing the personnel of elementary and secondary schools and, therefore, we may be in a better position to identify the challenges presented by Public Law 94-142. The policies expressed in the law seek the re-examination of the purposes of education, the relations of schools and families, and values and technical aspects of schooling. Our training efforts ought to be directed to these deeper strata of role and organizational changes required by the new policies.

One way of acknowledging the changes required by Public Law 94-142 is to identify and explicate the implications of the law for the foundations area of teacher preparation. Such a move would relate the significance of the law to the courses in sociology, philosophy, measurements, and similar topics which are covered by the phrase, "foundations of education." The NSSP conducted a conference in Denver at the end of March (1982) to discuss the role of foundations of education faculties in up-dating the preparation of teachers. The presenters included Christopher Lucas, a philosopher, whose paper summarizing and reflecting upon that conference is part of this report.

It is my experience that foundations faculty members are unaccustomed to talking to their colleagues in curriculum and instruction but, also, and perhaps more important, they frequently fail to communicate regularly with each other. For example, measurements specialists often conduct their courses with too little consideration for the social implications of what they are doing. Courses taught in isolation tend not to be effective. Perhaps all of us need to be reminded of the broad social context in which the schools operate. We need to be reminded, too, that the best teacher-education programs probably are those in which the faculty members have fully aired their ideas and come to some agreement about what schools should achieve and how teachers should perform to insure those achievements.

We were not wrong at that first national meeting of DGP representatives or in the more recent meeting on foundations of teacher preparation to take a broad perspective on the work of DGPs. Many people regard Public Law 94-142 as one of the most important policy statements on education ever made. In fact, what we are into in the Dean's Grant Projects is the revision of public education, changing the concept of what it is, who it is for, and how it should be provided. It has taken some of us a while to realize that the revisions underway are revolutionary.

The Classification of Children

One problem that is specific to observing the least restrictive environment principle is the classification of children. As you know, present systems of funding special education require children to be classified as "mentally retarded," "learning disabled," "speech impaired," "seriously emotionally disturbed," or in some comparable category to be eligible for services. The labeling that results is deeply resented and resisted by many people. Currently we are on the threshold of major changes in identifying children with special needs.

At a recent DGP meeting, Robert Audette, a former State Director of Special Education in Massachusetts, reported on a letter which he had received from the U.S. Office of Civil Rights (OCR). The import of the letter was that Massachusetts schools must follow tradition in classifying children for special services under federal law; otherwise how could OCR tell whether

the children were misclassified? This letter was a federal response to Chapter 766, the Massachusetts special education law covering the education of handicapped children; the law tries to minimize the need to categorize and label children before providing them with special services.

Audette also told about his work as a court-appointed expert in Mississippi. He and one other "expert" were called upon to help monitor the schools' compliance with a court order relating to the classification of students. Audette reported that an extraordinarily high percentage of the time (up to 95% in some districts) of specialists in the education of handicapped children was spent just on classification or entitlement decisions; as a result, these highly trained personnel were not available to help on the essential problems of instruction.

My colleague, Jim Ysseldyke, and his associates in the Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities at the University of Minnesota, have compared children in learning disabilities (LD) programs with other low-achieving pupils in the same schools who were not placed in special programs; they found that the children assigned to LD programs tended to have behavior problems. The conclusion, of course, is that special placements are not made strictly on the basis of technical discrepancies between intelligence and achievement which we suppose distinguish LD children; children assigned to special LD placements tend to be those who present behavior problems and, thus, are inconvenient to teach in regular classes.

Tucker (1980) reported a shift in the rates at which children were classified as LD in the state of Texas after educators were embarrassed by the racial overtones reflected in the overrepresentation of black children in the EMR category. In New Jersey, data for 1981 show that a black child is four times more likely to be classified as EMR than a white child in that state.⁴ And in Champaign, Illinois, the superintendent of schools reported a feeling of shock when he found that his school district was twenty-fourth on a list of the 100 most racially segregated special education programs in the nation (Mahon, First, & Coulter, 1980).

At the Wingspread Conference on public policy and the future of education, held in September 1961 (Reynolds, Brandl, & Copeland, in press), Gene Glass of the University of Colorado likened the present classification practices of special education for mildly and moderately handicapped children to the situation of schizophrenia in the mental health field some 20 years ago. He told about a conversation between two psychiatrists in which one said that he had heard of a new cure for schizophrenia. And the other said, "Well, that's interesting because in the same hospital I know two psychiatrists one of whom classifies schizophrenia at a 10% rate and the other at 90% in

⁴Oral report of a New Jersey State Department of Education official at the Council for Exceptional Children Conference in April 1982.

reference to the same hospital population." If we do not have reliability in the classification of children with learning problems and if the classifications are not treatment related, then we certainly need to make changes in how we go about making these decisions.

The problem is broader than just special education, of course. A variety of other narrowly framed programs, for example, for disadvantaged and low-English proficiency children, each with its special classification or entitlement procedures exists in many schools. Each program makes time-consuming procedural demands on specialists who must spend much time just on entitlement decisions, which keeps them from using their skills more productively in the instructional program.

Each categorical program also consumes the time of regular teachers who are expected to participate in referral and entitlement procedures. For example, all of us know about schools in which Title I teachers visit regular classroom teachers to negotiate the entitlement system for disadvantaged children, then the LD teachers come in with another, the ED with another, the EMH with still another, and the bilingual with still another--and then we wonder why a backlash against special programs occurs among regular teachers!

The classification problem affects even our national professional organizations. Consider, for example, The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC); it seeks to provide a broad organizational structure for special teachers and other personnel who work with handicapped children in the schools. The Council has about 55,000 members of whom about 9,000 belong to a Division on Learning Disabilities. During the Summer of 1982 that division is conducting a mail ballot on whether to disaffiliate from CEC. If the Learning Disability group pulls out with its thousands of members, it may destroy CEC at the very moment that the renegotiation of relations among different categories or professional streams must be accelerated. It is rare that one sees anything more self-destructive than this kind of enclave mentality.

We cannot justify the fragmentation of efforts and resources into so many different programs to serve children with various special needs; often these needs can be met by the same teachers. There is no separate knowledge base for teaching reading to Title I as contrasted with LD children; so why do we go on with these complicated, expensive, isolated, separate programs for children and pretend that the teachers need to be separately prepared? We owe to regular classroom teachers a more unified support structure that makes their situation more manageable; we owe to children the efficient provision of the instruction they need without going through time-consuming, wasteful, and hurtful processes of labeling; and we owe to the public the financial savings that could be generated by cutting out needless classification processes.

It is past the time to take a penetrating look at some of the categories we have been using to slot children for administrative and teacher-training

9

purposes. Note, if you will, that many of us conduct our teacher training in the same narrow, unreliable, inefficient categories as are used to classify children. This is one of the major areas for challenge and change in the near future; note carefully the remarks of Steve Lilly--author of one of the major papers in this report--on this topic.

Changing Social Structures

Another area in which change is imminent, I think, is in the ways the schools manage student social structures. The general movement toward greater inclusiveness in the schools has resulted, obviously, in a greater diversity of children in classrooms. William Copeland of the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, one of the initiators of the Wingspread Conference, made some trenchant observations on the functioning of schools in his epilogue to the conference report:

As the schools are now staffed, organized, and financed, they can only teach well if they exclude; conversely, if they do not exclude, they cannot teach well. Put another way, under present conditions, schools can meet their substantive educational requirements only if they violate constitutional requirements; or, they cannot meet their constitutional requirements only if they violate those substantive educational requirements....

Thus we are left with the following kinds of general options for the 1980s:

1. Back down on the constitutional mandates (or their procedural implementation), or
2. back down on the teaching goals, or
3. change the staffing (and preparatory education), organization (not only of schools internally but, also, of the governance of the education system), or financing (in amount as well as structure) of public schools, or all three.

The general thinking of the conference participants was that if we do not pay close attention to the third option, we shall have to suffer one or both of the first two. (Copeland, in press).

Included in the present report is a paper by Roger Johnson on how the classrooms of the regular school can be reorganized to make the diversity of pupils a "plus" rather than a problem. He discusses how children can be taught to be helpful to one another - to be cooperative - with gains for everyone concerned.⁵ The schools will succeed in being totally inclusive

⁵See also Roger Johnson and David Johnson, Promoting constructive student-student relationships through cooperative learning (1980), a resource unit distributed by NSSP.

only if we make some of the kinds of changes in social structures which Johnson and his colleagues have helped us to envision. The implications of these new insights are profound, both for school operations and for teacher education. Rarely has the content emerging from this line of research been included in teacher preparation, yet it is important that the environment of classrooms be improved.

Changes in Measurement and Assessment

Another area that is being restructured, one I can touch on only briefly, is measurement systems. Currently, we are required to set explicit goals for individual handicapped pupils and to measure their progress in the context of instruction. To perform the measurement function competently requires quite a different (or added) kind of preparation than most teachers now receive. Emphasis must be shifted mainly to curriculum-based (domain-referenced) assessment.

Little was said on this topic at the conference although it is basic to our concerns. Indeed, the way we go about measurements in the schools may be one of our fundamental operations. Such procedures relate to the design, evaluation, and motivation of the whole educational enterprise. I recommend a careful reading of the proceedings of the Foundations of Education Conference on this subject (Reynolds, 1982).

The "Related Services" Problem

Under Public Law 94-142 the schools are required to provide special education "and related services"; the latter is an interesting even if ambiguous phrase. Judicial interpretations have tended to broaden rather than narrow the concept of "related services." Thus we have situations, for example, in which health-related professions, such as PT and OT, are moving into the schools to provide "related services" as independent practitioners.

Schools are responsible for studying children carefully; for many children, this means reviews of their health as well as academic status. It is not clear how schools should make the decisions to call in health resources or who should pay for them.

In colleges and universities, our students in teacher education usually have little opportunity to interact with students in medicine, PT, OT, music therapy, speech-language therapy, and so on. Consequently, when they go into employment in the elementary or secondary schools they meet their colleagues in these professions as strangers. They have no common language for communication and little appreciation of what each can contribute to enhancing the education of handicapped children.

A few Dean's Grant Projects are beginning to look at the possibilities of cutting across the fields of education and health and social services. They are organizing shared training experiences for the several professions. We

need the insights of people conducting these projects as we work toward the solution of the "related services" issue and the general problem of coordinating services for handicapped students and their families. In particular we will find it helpful, I am sure, to turn to Carolyn Del Polito and other staff members of the Society for Allied Health Professions and learn about efforts to alert all the human services professions to the implications of Public Law 94-142.

The Need for Courageous Leadership

At the 1975 national DGP meeting, Geraldine Clifford suggested that the spate of law suits during the preceding decade may have been generated by the absence of leadership in education. Jeanne B. Frein, another reactor to Gilhool's address, also touched on the subject when she asked, "...how many educational decisions, or decisions that should be educational, are going to be made by judges/lawyers"? The question to which all educators must attend at the moment is whether future changes in education will continue to be reactions to judicial decisions and/or legislative enactments or whether they will be generated by the practicing members of the profession. The answers to this question will determine the kinds of schools in which children are educated in the future. Let me project some possibilities:

Projection 1. Heroic efforts are made in the face of great difficulties to hold together the public schools and present forms of teacher education. Nothing revolutionary is attempted; the emphasis is on accommodating the hard realities of the present situation. Something like 1200 extant colleges and universities continue to prepare teachers. Some institutions do a better job than others and they are honored modestly for their good work, but the change made in most programs are limited. Inroads continue to be made by legislators and other "outsiders" in the monitoring of quality in teacher education because few people have confidence in teacher educators' ability to manage their own house. This picture reflects the present unsatisfactory scene, one that could lead to the second projection.

Projection 2. The public schools simply fail. Despite their attempts they cannot provide quality education, and they collapse as central community institutions. The middle class deserts the public schools and only little enclaves of "special" children, each with a different diagnostic classification, are left in the large buildings. (Recently, an administrator of the State Department of Education in New Jersey reported that 52% of the children in the public schools of that state are now enrolled in one or more categorical programs, at least for part of each school day. These are the children who will be left in the public schools when the middle class takes off to swell the rolls of the private schools.) A corollary of this disastrous public school situation is that teacher-education programs, as we now know them, also fall into total disrepute and the schools (both private and public) begin

to employ substantial numbers of personnel who have little or no professional preparation.

Projection 3 - A more hopeful view! Small sets of teacher-education programs link voluntarily to do something of truly high quality. For example, eight or 10 deans of education and the institutions they serve join to work aggressively for "state of the art" levels of teacher preparation. In this they are joined by a few strong public policy leaders who sense the significance of professional teacher preparation and are willing to help educators seek improvement. They have examined the knowledge bases for teacher preparation and are willing to say what they think good teacher preparation is. Each group coordinates its activities so that some educators work on curriculum, show up when decisions effecting teacher education are to be made by the Congress, or appear as experts when NCATE standards are under review or difficult court cases about the quality of schooling are being heard. They publish the best ideas and aspirations and set a hard pace and standards for the improvement of teacher education. They support general organizations of teacher educators yet move ahead of such groups by magnifying the most progressive and promising aspects of teacher education. The Dean's Grant Projects as a whole could become this special kind of progressive force in teacher education. Subsets of DGPs also might serve as strong regional advocates for quality in teacher preparation.

The purpose of these projections is to emphasize our need for models of strength and quality in teacher education. The first two hold no promise for the future. We need people and institutions to spell out the "state of the art" and to reach for that level of operation in teacher education. Perhaps something like the third projection is realistic, indeed a necessity.

An argument encountered all too often in teacher education is what might be called the "know-nothing" view. It consists of pointing out how many different points of view there are on most issues in teacher education; it is an easy step from there to say that we "know nothing" for sure. Thus each institution spells out its own plans which are examined for quality only in procedural terms (e.g., numbers of books in the library, processes by which teacher education plans are made, etc.) in meeting their own goals. I consider such an attitude toward teacher education wrong and a major source of the great difficulties in public confidence which we now face. It is exactly the opposite of the view taken by the Bicentennial Report of the AACTE and by leaders such as B. O. Smith. Courageous leadership is needed to take the quality course: one that spells out the "state of the art" and begins to work for accountability at that level. Dean Scannell's paper in this report details this view.

Temporary Support Systems

I have been privileged to work with the Dean's Grant Projects for seven years. During that time I have operated NSSP as a temporary support system for the projects. As part of our work, we provided DGPs with the help of their peers, opened avenues of communication among DGPs and between DGPs and "outside" organizations, and supported creative people in projects to help them develop ideas and products which could be shared. Through the regional liaison system, most projects were visited by advocacy-oriented colleagues and some technical assistance was provided to projects when it was needed. There is more to the story, but it need not be detailed here.

I am a strong believer in temporary support systems as a means of adding impetus to and building upon the creativity of people in special projects (see Reynolds, 1975; the publication is a report of a conference on support systems held in Washington, D.C., May 1974). Temporary systems are not encumbered by the bureaucratic machinery of entrenched structures in which the life of the organization sometimes seems to take precedence over its purposes. Making decisions is relatively easy in the temporary systems; in larger standing structures members may agree on an important line of work, but they may not be able to do anything because "the committee does not meet until six months from now or next year." Often we do not have six months to resolve problems. Simple problems may become critical if one waits for consensus or for decisions at annual meetings!

The very nature of temporary support systems makes them more flexible and more immediate. They have the adaptability to solve small problems quickly and to prevent them from becoming large and threatening the life of the organization. Temporary support systems do not become inbred. They can seek out and use ideas generated in many places by many different people. In addition, they can work closely and constructively with permanent organizations in the field without competing with them. To my way of thinking, when a temporary support system goes out of business, the permanent structures in the field should be the stronger for having had the contributions of the temporary system.

Persons associated with temporary structures need to be absolutely clear with themselves that they are indeed temporary, that they are not going to go on forever. They must be ready to bow out at any time, as the NSSP is doing at this time.

I believe that the NSSP has been useful as a temporary support system for the Dean's Grant Projects. Our work ends with the fiscal year (June 1982), except for a brief extension to complete certain publications and reports. I strongly believe it was necessary to bring project personnel together in various ways during these past formative seven years. There may be some new form of support for the DGPs but winning support for temporary support systems in the future may be more difficult. I believe we should not

give up the idea, however, and I'm encouraged by what I hear from Ed Sontag on this subject. Perhaps support systems will be kept alive mainly through voluntary efforts, but some provision for national leadership is important, I believe. In any case, how the Dean's Grant Projects can continue some kind of network for mutual help and support is a question that should be considered by the projects as well as by Department of Education staff at this time.

Conclusion

I have tried to discuss some of the difficult challenges and problems which DGP personnel face in the future. Many of the topics touched upon are the subjects of more detailed discussion in this report. I have tried to be realistic and, yet, optimistic and, in particular, to express the belief that those of us associated with the Dean's Grant Projects have a special opportunity to provide the leadership to meet the difficult challenges of the future.

References

- Copeland, W. C. Strategies for special education in the 1980s: A conference epilogue. In M. C. Reynolds, J. Brandl, & W. C. Copeland (Eds.), Public policy and the special education task for the 1980s: Report of the Wingspread Conference. Policy Studies Review, in press.
- Lyons, G. Why teachers can't teach. Phi Delta Kappan, October 1980, 62(2), 108-112.
- Mahan, H. J., First, J. M., & Coulter, W. A. An end to double jeopardy: Declassification/transition of minority EMH students in Champaign, Illinois. Champaign, IL: Office of Transition and Programs for the Mildly Handicapped, 1980.
- Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). National technical assistance systems in special education. Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1975.
- Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). Foundations of teacher preparation: Responses to Public Law 94-142. Minneapolis, MN: National Support Systems Project, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1982.
- Tucker, J. A. Ethnic proportions in classes for the learning disabled. Journal of Special Education, 1980, 14(1), 93-105.
- Vlaandeven, R. B. Teacher competency testing: Status Report. Educational Measurement, 1982, 1(2), 17-20 & 27.

The 1980s: Teacher-Preparation Programs, Handicapped Children, and the Courts

Thomas K. Gilhool

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

George Will, in the Philadelphia Inquirer (April 26, 1982), commented on the U.S. Supreme Court's first decision in the *Pennhurst* case. His article, which carried the headline, "Indiana Case: Infant Doe Had No Chance," closed with the following statement:

To most citizens, the police and schools are the most visible and important agencies of government, but fear of crime is rising, and the collapse of confidence in public education may be the most important fact of the 1980s.

The courts have made it clear that conditions in many prisons constitute cruel and unusual punishment and that many states' treatment of disabled citizens constitutes the denial of equal protection of the laws.

Learned Hand, warning against excessive judicial activism, said, "It would be most irksome to be ruled by a bevy of platonic guardians." So it would, but also irksome are today's myriad and multiplying instances of misgovernment. Schooling and the preparation for schooling, it cannot be escaped, after the decade and a half of recent American history, are a central matter of government. Mr. Justice Douglas in one of his most poetic and last decisions for the United States Supreme Court, that of *Papachristou vs. City of Jacksonville*, wrote, "The promise of the American Constitution to each of its citizens is independence and self-confidence, the feeling of creativity, lives of high spirits rather than hushed suffocating silence."

The realization of that promise in our society has come to turn significantly upon the quality of education in the schools. Many decades ago the

Mr. Gilhool was the attorney for the plaintiff in the case of *Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Citizens (PARC) vs. Pennsylvania*, 343 F. Supp. 279 (E.D. Pa. 1972). This paper was transcribed from tapes and edited.

responsibility for the realization of that promise had come to rest significantly upon the schools, and if the next decade brings anything at all, I suspect it will be an even more significant set of expectations from the schools. Not for rhetoric, not for show, but for performance.

On Saturday, April 3, 1982, The New York Times addressed editorially, as it has been wont to do over the last couple of years, matters concerned with special education, disabled people, education in general, and the state of our politics. The paper had two occasions for writing the editorial: (a) the case of Amy Rowley,¹ which pends now in the U.S. Supreme Court, and (b) the circumstance of the New York City school system, the nation's largest, in addressing the allocations of Public Law 94-142 almost a full decade after those obligations arose, and the difficulties of such belated address.

Amy Rowley, when the case was started, was a third-grade deaf student, child of deaf parents, attending regular kindergarten and then regular primary grades. The question in the case was whether under the related services provisions of Public Law 94-142 the school system on the edge of Westchester County had to supply for her education full-time sign-language interpretation in the classroom. According to the evidence, the classroom arrangement was such that Amy was getting about 60 percent of what went on, but with sign-language interpretation she would be able to get 95 percent. With the 60 percent she ranked at the top of her third-grade class. It has appeared to many of us that Amy Rowley might well be a deaf Madame Curie, and the question in the case really may be whether it is fair for her to expect to be educated for such a possibility by the public schools.

The New York Times had three complaints about Rowley, Public Law 94-142, and the state of things: one was trivial; two, serious; and all three were incorrect. The trivial complaint was that if Amy was entitled to an interpreter then so, of course, were all other deaf children, and that would cost \$25,000 dollars a year times the number of deaf children. However, the record in the case showed that the interpreter, when the service was ordered many years ago, cost \$8,000, not \$25,000 a year. The less trivial question is--let me put it this way: I watched the pages of The New York Times after April 3 with great care, indeed religiously, waiting to see a letter from a dean of a distinguished college of education in these United States to The New York Times suggesting--let alone promising or predicting--that should, indeed, deaf children be entitled to schooling in regular classrooms with sign-language interpreters, the schools of education would not find it an unbearable burden to prepare teachers to be competent in sign language and to be able to bring that mastery with them into the classroom. I still await such a nontrivial response to the newspaper's trivial complaint. The editorial writer also com-

¹Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley, 50 U.S.L.W. 4925 (June 28, 1982).

plained, more seriously, "If Amy Rowley is entitled to all of that, what of black children and Spanish language children and poor children and gifted children and even plain old children - what of them?" One is immediately tempted, having read that question, to say, "Of course, for them the same." That, surely, is the answer to which we must come. I shall return to one path by which we may get to that answer.

But that was not the purport of The New York Time's question. Rather, the editorial writer was invoking the dean's rule (it was Alfred North Whitehead who called it the dean's rule): Somebody comes in and asks for something and you say, "Gee, you really ought to have it, but if I give it to you, I have to give it to everybody, so you don't get it." Whitehead called that equal injustice for all. And that was The New York Time's perspective. That is to say, since all children could not have it, Amy Rowley should not have it. They did not come close at all to the historic theme in American education or even to framing with directness the question for all children.

The third complaint was serious and, in significant part, correct. Given that New York City is struggling at this late date to begin the implementation of Public Law 94-142, but with the advantage of the experience of other school districts over the last decade, not to say of several decades before, The New York Times observed that it might be appropriate for a bit of a cooling-off period, for the New York City schools to look around a bit. Any headlong implementation of the law's requirements, the writer suggested, would result in the separation out of ordinary schooling of a great many children and, it was noted with great sophistication and correctness, there is no evidence that the separation out of children, however "special" you call them, into special classes and special programs, does them any good. On that the writer was correct. But the editorial was written as if Public Law 94-142 and the reigning law of the land required that separation out. You know and I know that Public Law 94-142 requires exactly the opposite, that is, integration.

I choose the word "integration" advisedly because it is the word that best describes what the Congress said: "[T]o the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children...[shall be] educated with children who are not handicapped...." That's the integration imperative. It has seemed for quite some time to many of us that the separation out of children who are identified as having the great range of nonspecific disabilities makes no sense at all.

Gene Glass's review of the literature of the late part of the last decade suggests, if it does not confirm for those of us who have thought it to be the case, that there simply is no evidence that the separation of children into LD, EMR, or ED programs does them any good at all. Their performance does not differ from the performance of children who are not separated out. It was a point made almost 20 years ago by Lloyd Dunn. It is impressive to me that that point and its consequences have been consistent themes in the work and thinking of the Dean's Grant Projects over the last seven years. Behind that

point, of course, and signal among its consequences, are questions on effective education: How do we so organize ourselves that children who are specifically or nonspecifically labeled and just plain children can be effectively schooled and learn to their fullest, and may realize something of Justice Douglas's promise?

The particular dimension of the questions I want to focus on is the technology-forcing role of the law. Congress was deeply aware during the three years of hearings on the bills that became Public Law 94-142, the extensive committee reports, and the several years of conversation on the floors of both houses that we know how to educate disabled children effectively, including, particularly, those who traditionally have been excluded from the schools altogether. But that knowledge has not been widely or significantly distributed to the school personnel who bear the day-by-day responsibility for effective schooling. Thus, in Public Law 94-142, the Congress included phrases and provisions that were designed to evoke--to force, if you will--that technology. Actually, it is not forcing the technology and its invention or development, although, perhaps, it has that indirect consequence: it is, of course, forcing the distribution of technology. That role, to the law in the American tradition and, indeed, in the wider Anglo tradition, is hallowed. It dates to the common law and to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

When anyone says to you, "Oh my! Isn't it strange what they are doing!" you should tell the person about a superb book by Morton J. Horwitz, who is at the Harvard Law School. The title is, Transformation of American Law, 1789-1865 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977). It tells the tale of the role of the courts from the 1820s through the 1840s in completely redoing the laws of commercial relations in order to enable the United States to enter the industrial age.

In particular, what I want to bring to your attention is the tradition sustained through the law, the requirement that arises at numerous points whenever important matters in the lives of citizens are at stake. It is the requirement for the use of the "state of the art." The focal distinction is between the state of the art and the state of the practice. Perhaps the most vivid, modern articulation of that distinction and of what the requirement for the use of the state of the art amounts to was by Learned Hand in a case decided by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in 1932, *In re T. J. Hooper*. T. J. Hooper was a tug boat. It is a very famous case; no well-educated lawyer presently practicing in these United States has escaped reading it; it is in every first-year torts course.

T. J. Hooper was a tug boat that got into trouble in the Atlantic Ocean off the east coast shore when a storm suddenly arose and the T. J. Hooper got caught in it. Remember, this was a 1932 decision on a set of events that arose in the late 1920s. At that time, tugs along the Atlantic coast relied for warning of sudden dangerous storms upon hand signals from the shore.

Radio had been introduced but it was used by only a few, not many, tug boats. T. J. Hooper did not use radio. Had the master used radio, he would have known of the storm, would have sought cover effectively, and the injury to life and property that occurred would have been avoided. The question in the case was, What was the duty of the T. J. Hooper? The award of damages to the people who themselves and whose property had been injured turned on the answer to that question. Learned Hand wrote for the court, as follows, "Is it, then, a final answer that the business had not yet generally adopted receiving sets?"

There are, no doubt, cases in which the courts seem to make the general practice of the calling the standard of proper diligence. Indeed, we have given some currency to that notion ourselves. In most cases, reasonable prudence is, in fact, common prudence, but, strictly speaking it is never its measure. A whole calling may unduly lag in the adoption of new and available devices. A calling never may set its own tests, however persuasive be its usages; that role falls to the courts.

As to receiving sets, some tugs had them, some did not. The most that can be said is that they had not yet become general. Certainly, in such a case, we need not pause when some have thought a device necessary; at the least we may say that they were right and the others, too slack. The court held that in the presence of important matters like property, the obligation is not to share the state of the practice, but to use the state of the art. What are the consequences of that? Let me first say that perhaps the phrase refers not to a unitary state of the art but to the states of the art as opposed to the state of practice. For example, recently, with the assistance of some educators, I have been seeking how to apply the state-of-the-art analysis to the teaching of reading or, if you will, the teaching of all the elementary skills. As a preliminary, I have been working my way through the 1975 Rand Report and the work of the IRT Center at Michigan State. I began to conclude the following: In the past 15 years the education profession has developed a range of methods to teach reading; they can be grouped into 10 or a dozen approaches/programs/methods. Each shares certain characteristics with the others. All are more or less individualized. Whatever their variations, the programs all seem to focus a teacher and child on tasks. More to the point, effectiveness has been demonstrated for each approach. That leads me to conclude, and I think it's what educators report, that there is now no reason for any child not to learn to read unless the child has a highly specific and severe disability. Among the range of demonstrated effective programs and approaches for each child and each set of children, one or another or a combination is going to work. Now then, if one considers any school system in the country and how it directs the basic education of all children, including those who are nonspecifically disabled, the question becomes, "What is the practice in that system?" And if the practice does not coincide with the state of the art of those 12 approaches, then the system is failing in its

state of the art duties and I expect that a court will call it to account.

Apart from putting the "s" on the "state" of the art--it is not a simple-minded matter any more than other areas of hard and soft technology have been for the law--one other thing comes out of my analysis which I want to make explicit. I said that these 10 or a dozen approaches to reading are developments of the last decade and a half, and it is clear to me that they are. It is clear to me that they are real. It is clear to me that the last decade and a half have not been decades of failure for educators but have been decades of significant accomplishments. Why do I say that? Because of the discouragement and despair that I have observed among educators from the street to the academy. Of all the lies current in these United States at this moment, perhaps the biggest is that the national attention to education, beginning in 1965, was a failure. That is false. Educators know the Carnegie assessment as well or better than I: School-leaving dropouts in urban areas of the United States diminished by factors of 2 and 3 during that time. And for the first time in the history of schooling in these United States, blacks entered college in the same ratio as whites as a consequence of the work of a decade and a half. That is a footnote. Another example is the state of the art in vocational education. During the last 15 years again, there have been demonstrated effective approaches to the teaching and learning of vocational skills. I refer, for example, to the experience of the Job Corps, to the ways and means by which they evoked skills from children who officially had been despaired of or, if you will, set aside. The Job Corps demonstrates the existence of states of the art which evoke effective vocational skills from young people.

Where are we now in terms of the law's current address of the state of the art? I think we are in a position to say that we have that duty not just in prospect but in the actual operation of the law with respect to severely disabled young people. Judge Vance of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting as a District Court Judge in Alabama in the case of *Campbell vs. Talladega County Board of Education*, decided March 31, 1981, addressed the schooling provided to a single severely disabled person. On the basis of the superb record made by many educators, Judge Vance made certain findings about what the person's schooling ought to look like and entered an order requiring the Talladega County Board and the State Board to supply that schooling and to do the things necessary to supply it. The judge gave to both defendants a choice between a program prepared by a professional currently practicing at a West Coast university; a program prepared for bringing the teachers in that boy's classroom up to snuff in terms of the operational mastery of how to move the classroom; a program for integrating that severely disabled child in an ordinary school environment, not full time, to be sure, but not a classroom across town from everybody else either; a program for schooling, because in severe disabilities one of the facts is nongeneralization, in real-life envi-

ronments so that the problem of transferability did not arise. The set of orders required schooling in the state of the art.

On or about June 1 Judge Becker, another Court of Appeals Judge elevated to that position on the Third Circuit by President Reagan, but until now a District Court Judge before whom PARC II has been pending, will have approved of the PARC II decree: a consent decree entered into between the Bar Association for Handicapped Children of Philadelphia and the Association for Retarded Citizens, and so on, and the School Districts of Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We expect the judge to articulate certain duties and ways of meeting them with respect to state of the art education for severely disabled people throughout the 80 classes or programs in Philadelphia and in the Commonwealth's work across the state. The evidence the plaintiffs put on over a period of seven weeks was the result of the work and thinking of our clients and of teacher educators from the University of Virginia, Richmond; the University of San Francisco; the University of Wisconsin at Madison; and Syracuse University: a team of about 14 superb professionals, many of them working together in the Association for the Severely Handicapped.

At first we had 17 dimensions of what the state of the art schooling for severely disabled children could look like. The professionals then went to a representative sample of Philadelphia's 80 classes to measure the practice against the state of the art. That dissertation caused the Philadelphia schools and the Commonwealth for the first time to turn to another set of professionals, one headed by someone from Johns Hopkins University, whom they sent in to look; and lo and behold the school districts and the professionals had the same analysis of the state of the art and the same judgments about the short fall between the practice and the state of the art. It was that record that brought all parties to agree to a consent decree whose provisions articulate the duty of state of the art and how we shall get there.

How we shall get there partakes most significantly of what we have come to call "clinical in-service training." Saturday morning workshops and a few further credit hours back on your campuses may be lovely for an intellectual appreciation but they seem to have little to do with operational commands, with such mastery of the state of the art that it comes out of the teachers' fingertips in the classroom day-by-day. In Philadelphia, there will be coming into each classroom for four hours every two weeks someone who has that state of the art coming out of his or her fingertips and who is also rather adept at communication; that someone will work with each teacher and related personnel in that particular program in order to evoke that competence.

What are the immediate direct legal bases of this state of the art duty? The first basis immediately at hand is, of course, Public Law 94-142. I say "of course," but I am not sure that I should. The teacher-preparation, and continuing education duties are I think, the single most overlooked provision of Public Law 94-142. The statutory provision is 20 USC 1413(a)3; it imposes

two duties:

(A) the development and implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development which shall include the inservice training of general and special educational instructional and support personnel, detailed procedures to assure that all personnel necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act are appropriately and adequately prepared and trained and effective procedures for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators of programs for handicapped children significant information derived from educational research, demonstration and similar projects, and (B) adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials developed through the such projects.

That is the direct national statutory command in the arena in which teacher educators are immediately working. Requiring the use of the state of the art rather than the state of the practice. If it has been done somewhere and worked you cannot use something that has not been done somewhere and does not work.

Other bases for the duty include a significant number of Constitutional approaches to state of the art duties. Some of them may proceed from the racial and national origin overrepresentation cases: Larry P., Diane, and so on. It may be that the remedy for racial overrepresentations is not simply the barring of IQ tests and the lot, as in Larry P., but rather, the abolition of separate classes for the nonspecifically disabled, their integration into regular school, and the use of effective approaches to education in those settings. I do not parse here the full run of Constitutional approaches to the state of the art question.

A footnote which Mr. Justice Brennan dropped in a case called *Townsend vs. Schwank* in the early 1970s is remarkably pregnant, however. It is the kind of footnote that you see to the history of the law, the kind of footnote to which one returns 10, 15, or 20 years later when suddenly, as if out of nowhere, the courts develop full blown a new approach to certain matters. The case concerned public assistance, and whether public assistance had to be available after age 18 not only so young recipients could go to college but, also, to vocational schools. It was a question of interpretation of the Social Security Act as it has been understood. The footnote plugs into the area of tracking which Judge Skelly Wright addressed in *Hansen vs. Holsen*. Mr. Justice Brennan, speaking for an unanimous court--the Burger Court--was straightforward: A classification that channels one class of people, poor people, into a particular class of low-paying, low-status jobs would plainly raise substantial questions under the equal protection clause.

The third basis for the state of the art obligations is just the plain, old, historic state school codes. Section 15-1515 of the Pennsylvania school code, a provision drafted in 1911, for example, says, "That it shall be the duty of each Board of Education to supply a course or courses of instruction adapted to the age, development, and needs of the pupils." The Connecticut Statute is, "a course or courses of instruction sufficient to meet the needs of the pupils." The Oregon Statute is, "a course or courses of instruction best suited to the pupil." From each of those statutes--and all of them I suspect--comes this state of the art duty.

What relevance has it to colleges and universities? Well, in a real sense teacher educators are the custodians, if not the progenitors, of the state of the art. That is their role in this profession. In a legal sense, a juridical sense, we have long passed the point in these United States where colleges of education are one thing and public schooling is another. It is a mark perhaps of the success of your predecessors that the two are one in these United States. The public function of certifying teachers as competent to teach is by and large delegated by the state to the colleges. The set of relations between schools of education and the public schools is such now that teacher educators, as much as the state education authorities and the local education authorities, must consider themselves bound by this duty to use effectively the state of the art.

The story of the origins of American education in the private city of Philadelphia in the early stages of its growth is interesting. There were two contending schools on the banks of the Schuylkill in the 1830s between which the city fathers made their choice. One, a school opened by Joseph Neff, who had been brought from Paris, was a school for 100 boys. It offered personal contact between teacher and pupil, great variety of content, stress on self-discovery, engaging discipline (the word for the day), and the example of a teacher's enthusiasm for learning. The school stressed nature study, open air classes, music, and oral instruction in order to liberate the natural talent and interest of each child. Philadelphians were wonderfully surprised to observe that despite the unbusiness-like setting of the school, Neff's pupils became lightning calculators and learned a great deal.

The second school was opened by Joseph Lancaster, a London Quaker, a man who would devise the classroom architecture which made it possible for one teacher to supervise 1000 children in a single classroom, using his best students as monitors. It is from this that the familiar pose of folded hands on the desks comes. He plied his trade in Philadelphia as well. The gratifying spectacle, in the words of the day, of hundreds of orderly pauper children receiving instruction at the cost of one large room and one school teacher's salary captured the philanthropists' imagination. When the Society for the Promotion of Public Economy, 1818, noticed the lack of schooling among the destitute and concluded that universal education could be a powerful

antidote to future poverty, and when 25 years later a city-wide system of public education was approximated, the system of choice was Lancastrian. In 1834 the pupil/teacher ratio in Philadelphia public schools was 218 pupils per teacher. In the then-budding urban industrial economy the educational method of choice was low-cost, mass uniformity of instruction, the provision of minimal skills demanded in the about-to-explode industrial society. The choice, of course, was between Aristotelian self-realization (Thomas Paynes' rhetoric was in that tradition) and the minimum schooling necessary to maintain economic institutions: Robert Morris's rhetoric and, one might say, Ronald Reagan's rhetoric.

That choice--between minimums necessary for the society somehow to function on its own and self-realization for each of its citizens--has been made and remade across the course of American education and politics. Indeed, in a real sense, the history of American politics and the history of American education are the same history, and it revolves around the making of those choices. We are, of course, making those choices again today. We may be making them in different circumstances. Clark Kerr pointed out within the year or two that we are not at the point any more when self-realization and minimum skills for the economic systems to function are two different things. We are, in the late twentieth century, at the point where perhaps even as a matter of simple economic survival vis à vis world competition, it may be necessary that each child be educated to the full reach of her or his skills.

One way to put the set of questions that pend in Washington is whether we shall, as the President seeks and the Rhenquist Court on several occasions has sought to, abolish Madison's National Legislature. The Federalism papers reflect that the point of the Congress was to have a place where the values of all the people might be aggregated, expressed, and set. In a real sense, those are the largest stakes in what we meanly recognize as battles about bloc grants and the rest. It is as if the Congress were to be reduced to accountancy which surely would leave us, as some would say, in the ante-bellum, the pre-Civil War world, and others would say, the Confederacy; we did not have then an authoritative place where the people could express authoritatively and set, for the society at large, our values as people. So, yes, it's about the distribution of resources and what dollars shall be there today and tomorrow and whether any shall be there. But in a deeper sense, it is about whether we shall have a place whereby these contending choices may be resolved, and it is fundamentally about what we shall choose.

I am impressed across the seven years of the Dean's Grant Projects with the similarity of your themes, the similarity of the analysis of the purposes and functions of schooling that are reflected in the projects' goals, to those grand themes that cross American history. Teacher educators have, if I may say so, a coherent view of where American education is and where it should be, but since they are so very close to it they may not recognize the coherence;

those of us who watch from farther away see it. Whether the view is right or whether it is wrong, the fact that it is coherent marks it as nearly unique in current society. There is great strength simply in coherence. I happen to believe that your developing view of where American education may go is correct. Surely it is so steeped in recent experience and in the values of which I have spoken, and which many of you have lived, that it requires, I think, that we should pursue the promise of those views.

I return to the special responsibilities of teacher educators. I mentioned earlier that the colleges and universities are the custodians of the state of the art. They are also, I believe, in this year, the custodians of the future of American education, that is to say, what you do and say or what you don't do and say will significantly alter how the public issues are framed or not framed and, hence, significantly alter the public decisions being made in Washington and in state capitols presently. I alluded earlier to the discouragement and despair and its intellectual dimensions, namely, that somehow willful blindness to what you have effectively done in the last 15 years; but it has also still another dimension: it is the dimension, frankly, to which George Will harkens again and again. This week, in Monday's Philadelphia Inquirer, the syndicated column on Infant Doe opened with, "The baby was born in Bloomington, Indiana, the sort of academic community where medical facilities are more apt to be excellent than moral judgments are." You are scientists, you are people of art but you are also, because of the special place of schools in the American society, not platonic guardians but political people. The question is whether you choose to act upon those responsibilities or whether you choose to be acted upon.

The Social Structure of School Classrooms

Roger Johnson & David Johnson

University of Minnesota

Mainstreaming begins when a handicapped student walks into the regular classroom and faces his or her new classmates for the first time. While the handicapped child may feel apprehensive and afraid, the nonhandicapped children may be experiencing discomfort and uncertainty. There is strain on both sides and no guarantee that the students will feel any more comfortable with each other as time passes. Mainstreaming carries the risk of making relationships between handicapped and nonhandicapped students worse as well as better. The way in which student-student interaction is structured during instruction determines whether mainstreaming is positive and successful.

For the past several years, we have been investigating procedures regular classroom teachers can use to insure that mainstreaming is a success. We begin with three assumptions: (a) that it is unnecessary and unrealistic to ask regular classroom teachers to become experts in special education as expertise on special education is already present in the school; (b) that any teaching strategy implemented in the regular classroom to facilitate the integration of handicapped students should benefit the education of all students, not just those with special learning needs; and (c) that building positive relationships between handicapped and normal-progress students is the first priority of mainstreaming. It is when handicapped students are liked, accepted, and

Both David and Roger are Professors in the College of Education: David, whose specialty is Educational Psychology, is in the Department of Social, Psychological, and Philosophical Foundations of Education; Roger is in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. The brothers also are Principal Investigator and Co-Investigator respectively of the Cooperative Learning Project (funded by the U. S. Department of Education).

¹The material presented in this chapter is taken from the following publication: R. T. Johnson & D. W. Johnson, Staff Development for the Social Integration of Handicapped Students into the Mainstream. Journal of Staff Development, 1981, 2, 70-82.

chosen as friends that mainstreaming becomes a positive influence on the lives of both handicapped and nonhandicapped students.

Integration into the Mainstream

Any definition of mainstreaming that does not recognize the importance of relationships for handicapped students with nonhandicapped peers is incomplete. It is nonhandicapped peers who provide handicapped children and adolescents with entry into the normal life experiences of their age groups, such as going to dances, taking buses, going to movies, shopping, knowing what is "cool" and what is not, and dating. Constructive peer relationships are not only an absolute necessity for maximal achievement and healthy social and cognitive development, they may be the primary relationships within which development and socialization take place. Handicapped students especially need access to highly motivated and appropriately behaving peers.

Placing a handicapped student in the corner of a classroom and providing individualistic learning experiences is not effective mainstreaming. Mainstreaming is successful only if it includes the integration of handicapped students into friendships with nonhandicapped peers (Johnson, 1979; Johnson & Johnson, 1978). Thus, a definition of mainstreaming is as follows:

Mainstreaming is the provision of an appropriate education opportunity for all handicapped students in the least restrictive alternative, based on individualized educational programs, with procedural safeguards and parent involvement, and aimed at providing handicapped students with access to and constructive interaction with nonhandicapped peers.

Mainstreaming is not something you do for a few students but, rather, something you do for all students. In our research, for example, we have found that when nonhandicapped students collaborate with handicapped peers on instructional tasks, the result is increased empathy, altruism, and ability to view situations from a variety of perspectives. The instructional procedures needed for constructive mainstreaming also benefit nonhandicapped students: the shy student sitting in the back of the classroom, the overaggressive student who seeks acceptance through negative behaviors, the bright but socially inept students, and the average student who does his or her work but whom the teacher never seems to notice. Even the most well-adjusted and hard-working students benefit from the instructional techniques associated with mainstreaming when it is conducted with some competence.

In sum, the central purpose of mainstreaming is to integrate handicapped students into constructive relationships with nonhandicapped peers so that both benefit cognitively and socially. Not all peer relationships are constructive however. To have positive impact, they must be characterized by acceptance, support, and caring. The task for teachers, therefore, is to organize instruction so that interaction among handicapped and nonhandicapped

students is maximized and leads to supportive, accepting, and caring relationships.

How Can Constructive Student-Student Interaction Be Promoted?

When a teacher wishes to mainstream handicapped students into instructional situations with nonhandicapped peers, learning can be organized in one of three ways (Deutsch, 1962; Johnson & Johnson, 1975): (a) cooperatively (positive goal interdependence), (b) competitively (negative goal interdependence), and (c) individualistically (no goal interdependence).

In a cooperative learning situation, the teacher establishes a group goal and a criterion-referenced evaluation system, then group members are rewarded on the basis of their group performance. Thus, a teacher may assign students to small groups (each containing at least one handicapped student), give them a set of math problems to solve, instruct them to reach agreement as a group on the correct answer for each problem and to make sure that every group member can solve every problem and then detail the criteria which will be used to evaluate the group's work.

In a competitive learning situation the teacher establishes an individual goal and a norm-referenced evaluation system; then students are rewarded on the basis of how their work compares with the work of their classmates. Thus, a teacher gives students a set of math problems to solve, instructs them to try to outperform their classmates by solving more problems in less time, and rewards the winning students.

In an individualistic learning situation the teacher establishes an individual goal, a criterion-referenced evaluation system, and rewards students strictly on the basis of their individual performances. Thus, a teacher may give each student a set of math problems, instruct students to work alone and to complete as many problems as they can without bothering other students, and then evaluate each student's independent work.

Each way of structuring learning goals promotes a different pattern of interaction among students (Johnson & Johnson, 1975, 1978).

The process of building accepting, caring relationships begins with handicapped and nonhandicapped students being placed in small, heterogeneous learning groups and given the assignment of completing a lesson as a group, making sure that all members master the assigned work. In other words, a positive interdependent learning environment is created.

The key to cooperative interaction is for students to believe that they are in a "sink or swim together" situation, a situation in which they are responsible for both their own learning and the learning of other group members. Positive interdependence means that students perceive that if any group member is to achieve his or her goal, everyone in the group must achieve the goal.

There are a number of ways teachers can create feelings of interdependence

among students. Giving grades on the basis of the group's performance rather than on individual performance is a common method. Yet teachers are able to create the "we are all in the same boat" feeling without using group grades. Some teachers award individual grades and then add bonus points if all members of the group are above a certain criterion. Some teachers divide up materials so that no one student can complete the assignment without working closely with the other members of his or her group. Some teachers assign roles to students in the group (e.g., reader, recorder, encourager of participation by all members). A variety of methods are discussed in Chasnoff (1979), Johnson & Johnson (1975), and Lyons (1980).

For each cooperative learning assignment, there must be a procedure to insure individual accountability. It is not a cooperative situation when one member of the group does all the work and the other members fail to learn the assigned material. In order for group members to give each other effective help and assistance, and in order for the teacher to provide the needed support and encouragement, the individual progress of each group member must be known. A double bookkeeping system is often followed where both individual and group grades are recorded by the teacher. At times, teachers may give each student an individual test and then take the group total to determine the group grade; or a student may be picked randomly from the group to take the quiz with the understanding that the student's score will determine the group's grade. Or each person in the group can be required to teach successfully the information he or she has learned to another student from a different group who has not yet studied the material. Such procedures maximize the pressure among group members for everyone to master the assigned material.

Compared with competitive and individualistic learning situations, working cooperatively with peers in a positive interdependent learning environment (Johnson & Johnson, 1975, 1978)

1. creates a pattern of positive interaction in which there is
 - a. more direct face-to-face interaction among students;
 - b. an expectation that one's peers will facilitate one's learning;
 - c. more peer pressure toward achievement and appropriate classroom behavior;
 - d. more reciprocal communication and fewer difficulties in communicating with each other;
 - e. more actual helping, tutoring, assisting, and general facilitation of each other's learning;
 - f. more open-mindedness to peers and willingness to be influenced by their ideas and information;
 - g. more positive feedback to and reinforcement of each other;
 - h. less hostility, both verbal and physical, expressed toward peers;
2. creates perceptions and feelings of

- a. higher trust in other students;
- b. more mutual concern and friendliness for other students, more attentiveness to peers, more feelings of obligation to and responsibility for classmates, and a greater desire to win the respect of other students;
- c. stronger beliefs that one is liked, supported, and accepted by other students, and that other students care about how much one learns and want to help one learn;
- d. lower fear of failure and higher psychological safety;
- e. higher valuing of classmates; and
- f. greater feelings of success.

As nonhandicapped students work closely with handicapped peers, the boundaries of the handicap become more and more clear. While handicapped students may be able to hide the extent of their disability when they are isolated, intensive interaction in cooperative learning situation promotes a realistic as well as differentiated view of handicapped students and their disabilities. If a handicapped member of a learning group cannot read or speak clearly, the other members of the learning group become highly aware of that fact. With interaction, however, there also comes a decrease in the primary potency of the handicap and a decrease in the stigmatization connected with the handicapped person.

Along with the more realistic and dynamic perception of each other, a direct consequence of cooperative experiences is that nonhandicapped students' acceptance of and liking for handicapped peers increases when interaction occurs within a context of positive goal interdependence, and the self-attitudes of both nonhandicapped and handicapped students also become more positive (Deutsch, 1949, 1962; Johnson & Johnson, 1975, 1978).

Both competitive and individualistic learning activities provide little or no information about handicapped peers, thus allowing initial stereotypes to continue. What little information is available is likely to confirm existing stereotypes that handicapped peers are "losers" and "different." The boundaries of the handicap are not clarified and the labeled handicap maintains its primary potency and the stereotype can even become stronger. It does not make any sense to mainstream handicapped students into the regular classroom and have them compete with the other students. That does not build acceptance. It is equally ludicrous to mainstream students into the regular classroom to work alone, individualistically, where they are seen, but no interaction takes place. The only interaction pattern which builds acceptance of differences and positive relationships between handicapped and nonhandicapped students is cooperation.

If you want students to cooperate, you must so structure the environment. There is a set of practical strategies regular and special education teachers can use to structure cooperative learning activities in the classroom. For a

more extensive discussion of such strategies, see Chasnoff (1979), Johnson and Johnson (1975), and Lyons (1980).

Summary

The central question in mainstreaming for the classroom teacher is, "How will handicapped and nonhandicapped students interact with each other?" Placing handicapped students in the regular classroom is the beginning of an opportunity but, like all opportunities, it carries a risk of making things worse as well as the possibility of making things better. Physical proximity of handicapped and nonhandicapped students does not guarantee positive attitudes and increased acceptance; increased prejudice and rejection may be the result. The crucial factor in whether a process of acceptance or a process of rejection occurs in the classroom is the kind of student interaction fostered by the teacher. Although competition and individualism tend to support rejection, cooperative interactions between handicapped and nonhandicapped students encourage the positive social interactions that bring handicapped students into the mainstream of classroom society. It is crucial to note that structuring cooperative learning is not something done for the handicapped students, it is beneficial to all students. The research indicates that it encourages higher achievement and more appropriate self-esteem for all students and more positive social interactions throughout the classroom.

Cooperative instruction is based on a set of practical strategies that any teacher can master. It does not require the classroom teacher to become an "expert" in special education.

References

- Chasnoff, R. (Ed.). Structuring cooperative learning: The 1979 handbook. New Brighton, MN: J & J Book Co., 1979.
- Deutsch, M. Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. In M. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1962, 275-320.
- Deutsch, M. A theory of cooperation and competition. Human Relations, 1949, 2, 129-152.
- Johnson, D. W. Educational psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1979.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. Learning together and alone: Cooperation, competition, and individualization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (Eds.). Social interdependence in the classroom: Cooperation, competition, individualism. Journal of Research and Development in Education (special issue), Fall 1978, 12(1).
- Lyons, V. (Ed.). Structuring cooperative learning: The 1980 handbook. New Brighton, MN: J & J Book Co., 1980.

Foundations Aspects of Teacher-Education Programs: A Look to the Future

Christopher J. Lucas

University of Missouri/Columbia

In his letter extending an invitation to address this conference, Charlie Lakin remarked, "For most of the life of the Dean's Grant Projects, we have not adequately appreciated how rich and useful educational foundations coursework and experiences can be in preparing teachers to work with students with diverse needs. Denver¹ convinced us that this can and should change."

The charge to which I will try to respond is somewhat complex: (a) to offer a retrospective summary of the Denver meeting in order to share a few of my general impressions; (b) to recapitulate a portion of the paper I delivered there, the part relating generally to the nature and role of educational foundations; (c) to outline what the future role of the foundations may be in teacher preparation; and (d) to indicate the potential for interrelating foundational issues and concerns with technical subject matter and training in teacher-preparation programs. Obviously, this is no small order.

Denver Conference

I should emphasize at the outset that my comments are necessarily subjective and I speak only for myself. Others' recollections of the conference may differ, as will their interpretations. But I wish to speak as openly and candidly as I can.

Six major papers including my own were presented. Represented were a philosopher of education, an anthropologist, a counseling psychologist, a

Dr. Lucas is Professor of Education Studies at the University of Missouri-Columbia. He is Past President of the American Educational Studies Association and former Executive Secretary of the Council for Learned Societies In Education. His primary research interest is in the philosophy of education in teacher education.

¹Conference on Foundations Aspects of Teacher Education in Dean's Grant Projects, March 31-April 2, 1982, Denver, Colorado. See M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), Foundations of Teacher Preparation: Responses to Public Law 94-142. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1 Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036).

learning theorist, a measurement and assessment specialist, and a teacher-educator interested in experiential education. Among the respondents (educational psychologists were perhaps overrepresented) only one historian and no specialists in comparative/international education were included (an international dimension was provided one evening however).

My initial attitude was one of skepticism. Here we have, I thought, a transparent attempt to co-opt foundational scholars in their role of teacher-educators and to induce them to devote more time and energy to the social mandate enshrined in Public Law 94-142. My feeling also was one of weary déjà vu: We went through this before with racism, sexism, ethnicity, internationalism, and a host of other good and worthy social concerns. In each case, new pressures were generated on the foundations.

At first, my worst fears seemed realized. We appeared to share no common universe of discourse. We all addressed different topics, using incommensurate and rather narrow frames of reference. Conference participants exaggerated consensus and minimized differences. Everyone was polite. Many hard issues were glossed over or not even raised for consideration. We talked at cross-purpose to one another.

By the second day, however, things had changed considerably. We were much more candid. Communication vastly improved. We began to better appreciate commonalities of interest and concern. We began to sense more clearly our intellectual and professional interdependence. We theorized at length--it is something foundations people do well--and when we strayed too far afield, Reynolds was there to remind us of the focus of concern that had brought us together.

At one point, someone, I think it was Reynolds, advanced the startling and seemingly improbable suggestion that Nona Tollefson, a measurement specialist, and I, a philosopher of education, ought to collaborate in designing a new measurement and assessment course.

His remark reflected, I think, a sensitivity to what was happening. Disagreements persisted. Yet we were beginning to discover how much we shared in common. We began to see, like the many facets of a single prism, the strengths in our diverse outlooks and disciplinary perspectives. And we learned how much more we had to learn from one another. (To affirm this is one thing; to truly feel it, another.)

Time constraints proved frustrating. Much was left unsaid. No grand integration or synthesis was achieved. But if any lessons were learned, they include the following:

1. We must all of us continuously re-invent programs of professional teacher preparation.
2. Each of us must guard against intellectual parochialism or ego-centricity, and against the tendency to assume our own concerns should be paramount.

3. We must discover or create new ways of synthesizing, and rendering coherent, the many diverse elements required in a viable preparatory program. If teacher educators themselves are fragmented and divided, it is unlikely (as we sometimes assume) that our students will enjoy any greater sense in putting it all together as a unitary whole.
4. Finally, the process of moving toward greater coherence and synthesis is intellectually demanding, usually painful, and inevitably time consuming. But it must be done, as an on-going process. The alternative is incoherence, divisiveness, and the sacrifice of professional and academic integrity to expedience, territoriality, and institutional politics.

Role of Educational Foundations in Teacher Education

The Plight of Teacher Education Programs

There can no longer be any doubt that teacher education in this country has fallen upon hard times. Public disaffection is rife, accompanied, it must be added, by a visible erosion of popular support for institutionalized schooling in general. Even complaints from within the educational establishment have become commonplace. Specific allegations and complaints directed against teacher education are too painfully familiar to bear lengthy rehearsal. Critics are prone to point out the relative mediocrity of students preparing for teaching careers, as contrasted with the stronger academic ability of their counterparts in the arts or sciences. It is alleged that education professors themselves are inferior in terms of scholarly expertise and teaching skill; that pseudo-scientific folklore too often masquerades under the guise of "educational research"; and that existing education courses--required at the expense of a liberal arts education and a necessary specialization in a teaching field--are monotonous, repetitious, shallow, and lacking in solid content. The historic schism between academic departments in the university and the schools, colleges, or the department of education that emerged from them and from which they borrow subject matter is allegedly as pronounced as ever.

Clearly, reforms will have to be both fundamental and comprehensive. Proposals to date have ranged from the minor internal reorganization of conventional programs to the superimposition of an extended graduate study sequence upon a four-year undergraduate substructure. More radical, however, has been the call for the abandonment of teacher education altogether, prompted in part by the conviction that dedication, good intentions, and actual experience are sufficient for good teaching; and that in any event it is impossible to impart pedagogical expertise in any formal structured fashion.

It needs to be said that calls for the abolition of teacher education rest upon the peculiar assumption that one does not learn to teach by thinking about and preparing to teach; rather, one learns solely by doing, a counsel not dissimilar to advising the laboratory scientist to learn to conduct experiments through sheer trial and error.

The standard rejoinder at this juncture is that scientists, physicians, or lawyers--the professionals with whom teachers are most frequently compared--are in possession of a body of theoretical knowledge and a functional technology for its application, whereas educators are bereft of disciplinary foundations and, consequently, do not qualify as professionals. But if efforts to define education as a profession can be construed as more than a simple struggle for academic legitimacy, and if, in turn, prospects for education's acceptance as a profession turn upon its status as an academic discipline analogous to psychology, sociology, or political science, then the whole issue can be shown to have momentous import for the future of "professional" teacher education. The argument here rests on two counts. (a) A profession invariably wins autonomy only when its practitioners are in command of a reasonably coherent body of knowledge, that is, a discipline. (b) This occurs historically when the nascent profession moves from domination by self-taught practitioners or an apprenticeship system to the imposition of a lengthy preparatory period as a prerequisite for successful practice. Formal training becomes important and serves as a conspicuous augury of professionalism precisely because the complexity of a practitioner's functions generates the development of a complex body of theory.

The growth of teacher education represents something of a logical and historical anomaly, however, in that the establishment and expansion of formal training programs both preceded and outstripped education's theoretical underpinnings. Herein lies a major part of the problem.

If the foregoing analysis is correct, then it follows that controversy over the status of education as a discipline is more than the precious semantic quarrel it sometimes appears to be. Any workable rationale for the perpetuation of formal teacher education may hinge largely upon the success with which education can be organized as an academic field of study on the basis of a measure of scholarly integrity, a degree of disciplinary integration, and a set of distinctive conceptual instruments for furthering inquiry. At any rate, the alleged deficiencies of existing education courses are attributable in generous measure to the amorphous state of education studies today.

Few observers would deny that pedagogical endeavor desperately needs to be transformed into an undertaking with a theoretical basis for study and analysis, and with its processes under systematic scrutiny so they can be improved. Failing this, the conduct of education probably will continue to reflect little more than a struggle for power among contending factions, forever subservient to passing fashionable persuasions and the bandwagon sloganeering

that all too frequently substitutes for careful reflection upon the issues at hand. By the same token, teacher-education programs will continue to invite--and deserve--contempt for their disorganization, their endless proliferation of watered-down courses, and their chronic lack of intellectual rigor.

I shall not dwell on the all-too-familiar Scylla-Charybdis dilemmas of pre-service undergraduate teacher education from the internal perspective of the professionals who service the programs. As teacher educators, we are all aware of why so many of us feel compelled to expand or extend preparatory training. We know, too, that either thrust confronts formidable counterpressure. On the one hand, the question is how much additional professional preparation is genuinely needed to foster improved methodological competence. Greatly exacerbating the situation is the ever-lengthening list of curricular accretions in elementary and secondary schools in response to various and sundry societal ills: sexism, racism, economic inequality, illiteracy, domestic instability, unemployment, injustice, urban unrest, social disorder and lawlessness, drug abuse, crime, juvenile delinquency, sexual permissiveness, political corruption, and so on ad infinitum, all of which also impact upon teacher education. On the other hand, the issue is at what sacrifice new programs can be devised to respond to these very real needs.

Unfortunately, as long as the notion persists that for ever, societal problem there must be a school response, and as long as professional educators accede to the public clamor for institutionalized education to take on new responsibilities, the range of school programs will increase. This proliferation of curricula in turn imposes new burdens on teacher preparation. Kevin Ryan observed not long ago, "Each new emphasis is shoe-horned into an already crowded curriculum...Usually, the important new mission is stretched out to form a thin veneer of curricular content and is added to the teacher-education program like another layer of onion skin."²

As new social-engineering objectives strain the "onion-skin" teacher-education curriculum, almost ineluctable pressures are generated to expand professional training at the expense of general education. Then the problem becomes one of finding an optional trade-off between broad, general instruction in academic disciplines and technical training geared expressly to the needs of future classroom practitioners. Traditional academicians, it may be argued, tend to underestimate the need for the latter, whereas beleaguered teacher-educators, for their part, lack sufficient appreciation for the former. Whereas teachers clearly need more and better preparatory training, the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind engendered by general education are also critical.

²K. Ryan, Mainstreaming and teacher education: The last straw. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of Public Law 94-142 to teacher education. Minneapolis: National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota, 1979, p. 4.

Needless to add, teachers must acquire thorough competency in the subjects they teach. Even granting that pre-service teacher education offers minimal preparation at best, the argument could be made that not all essential professional competencies can or should be taught directly. Obviously, the need for a better configuration of all elements--one balancing out general studies, pre-professional education in undergirding disciplines, instruction in subject-matter specialties, professional training and clinical experience--is as essential as it has so far proven elusive; and experimentation will likely continue. Whether fundamental and far-reaching reform or ad hoc cosmetic alterations will prevail remains to be determined.

Meanwhile, the expedient seized upon by many teacher-educators is to extend preparatory programs. Again, such proposals have generated a voluminous literature and need not be reviewed here. Some critics argue that extended training would merely provide "more of the same" and serve to delay the radical restructuring needed in contemporary teacher training. Others question whether the added cost might not eliminate otherwise qualified low-income students and, for example, discourage many minority candidates from seeking admission to the teaching profession. For these and other reasons, five-year programs would not be feasible for many institutions in either the public or private sector of American higher education. For others, however, extended programs may be workable options. Experimentation in this respect will be closely scrutinized in years to come.

More likely in the immediate foreseeable future are trends that simply will aggravate present difficulties. Many critics have observed that as school enrollments decline, a decreased demand for teachers will follow. Current economic conditions probably will continue, even as the cost of sustaining teacher-education programs increases. Public support for teacher education will not improve and, accordingly, available resources are likely to shrink or, at best, to remain at their present patently inadequate levels. Any dramatic improvements in programs are therefore unlikely. Competition among institutions to offer minimally acceptable preparatory training almost certainly will intensify, as will competition among local, regional, state, and national organizations and schools, departments, and colleges of education for the inservice teacher-education market. The trend toward the shaping of pre-service curricula by external agencies rather than education faculty will continue unabated and, possibly, will accentuate in the future.

Viewed against the backdrop of these trends and bearing in mind the "life-space" strictures of today's teacher-education programs, the future of educational foundations appears problematic. Before turning to this issue, the prior question is, "What are the foundations of education and what role do they play in preparatory programs, however these may be organized?"

Foundations of Education

The term "educational foundations" or "foundations of education" commonly refers to those humanistic studies that link the theory and practice of education with insights from other social-science disciplines and humanities, for example, philosophy of education, history of education, sociology of education, and so on. Their task is not to produce any specific pedagogical expertise *per se*, that is, they are not intended to teach people how to teach; rather, they provide a context or framework within which the educational enterprise can be better understood. Drawing upon the conceptual apparatus, modes of inquiry, and data of other disciplinary perspectives, educational foundations help to illuminate the broader meaning of theories, policies, and practices in education. The expectation, of course, is that improved theoretical comprehension will lead to more intelligent, informed practice. But the connection between the former and the latter is neither always immediate nor direct.

The closest thing to an authoritative characterization of foundational studies appears in the Preamble to the Standards For Academic and Professional Instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies and Educational Policy Studies (1977), drafted under the auspices of the American Educational Studies Association (AESA) and endorsed by several other learned and professional education societies. The text, in part, reads as follows:

The Foundations of Education refers to a broadly conceived field of study that derives its character and fundamental theories from a number of academic disciplines, combination of disciplines, and area studies: history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, religion, political science, economics, psychology, comparative and international education, educational studies, and educational policy studies....An overarching and profoundly important academic and professional purpose unifies persons who identify with...Foundations of Education, namely, the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education....

It is worth noting at the outset that foundational teacher educators in recent years appear to have been forced into a somewhat defensive stance. In an era when the impetus has been to reconceptualize teacher training in "competency-based" or "performance-based" terms, many have found it difficult if not impossible to effect an appropriate translation for the "development of interpretive, normative and critical perspectives" in education. Given already overcrowded curricula and the increasing politicization of decisions governing what will be included in teacher-education programs, many faculty members whose stock-in-trade is theoretical knowledge are also uneasy over pressures to de-emphasize theory in favor of clinical experience. When the stress is upon pedagogical technique, some of us fear that the potential contribution of interpretive, normative, and critical contextual knowledge is likely to be underestimated and to go unappreciated. Significantly, most

Attempts to develop a "common body of practice" for teachers emphasize what the classroom practitioner should be able to do, rather than what he or she should know. Hence the potential for the erosion of educational foundations as a vital element within programs may be quite substantial. Lacking an adequate foundational component, or so it is argued, professional teacher education all too easily could degenerate into a rudimentary form of apprenticeship training.

To some extent, I would judge, foundations scholars have brought down criticism on themselves. They are caught in the middle, between liberal arts scholars on the one side and their colleagues in teacher education on the other. The root of the problem can be traced to one central internecine conflict between those educators who perceive foundational studies as liberal-academic disciplines and those who view the field as functional and professional, of direct utility to practitioners.

Some foundations people insist that their role is to provide educators with scholarly insight, analysis, and perspective. But basically, their task as they see it is to seek and impart academic knowledge without explicit regard for its application. Their argument is for more purity and rigor and for the disinterested pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. Education is conceived of as a scholarly academic field of study analogous to other fields. One studies about education as one studies economic or political or social phenomena and institutions.

In opposition, other foundational scholars argue for the importance of policy-oriented information and the practical relevance of what they teach. Hence, they are attacked on all sides. Their liberal arts counterparts view them with suspicion and, all too often, assail the legitimacy of what they attempt to do. They are "educationists."

The educational professoriate, on the other hand, does not know what to do with foundations people in their midst either. To the extent that foundational scholars hold themselves aloof from the fray, turn inward, or retreat into the domain of ever increasingly specialized academic esoterica, suspicions are reinforced that foundational studies are irrelevant and impractical. The fact that much of the time foundational courses have been poorly taught has simply made matters worse.

Nonetheless, the fact remains that teacher education provides the "life-blood" and the institutional base for foundational scholarship and teaching about education. Historians, philosophers, and sociologists of education, for better or worse, are teacher educators before they are disciplinary specialists. Their professional existence depends in large measure upon courses taught in teacher-preparation programs.

Until recently, judgments on how extensive this role may have been largely conjectural or based on a limited range of institutional experience. With two or three partial exceptions, relevant empirical research on a

national scale was virtually lacking. However, a survey encompassing a large stratified sample of the estimated 1,033 schools, colleges, and departments of education offering teacher-education programs as of 1979-80, has proven more revealing. A brief summary of its principal findings is instructive.

Foundations courses, long the academic staple of teacher preparation, typically account today for only a small percentage of the total required hours of professional education coursework, usually less than 1/5 or 1/6 of the whole. Not counting psychology of education, the usual program requires no more than 1 or 2 courses in foundations and, characteristically, one course is a multipurpose omnibus, Introduction to Education, as a profession and/or field of study. The content is apt to be a potpourri of topics, issues, concepts, and subject matter; brief treatments of aims, methodologies, and organizational patterns; segments of a philosophical, historical, sociological, and legal character, and perhaps a necessarily cursory overview of selected issues or trends in education. Overall, the scope of coverage is broad and virtually precludes much in-depth analysis of any given topic.

When a second course is required to satisfy a foundational requirement or students are permitted to select from among alternatives, program offerings include, in descending order of frequency, philosophy of education, history of American education, curriculum theory, issues and trends in education, school law, school organization and management, sociology of education, history of educational thought, comparative and international education, and several others.

When the faculty members who teach such courses were queried on aims and purposes of instruction, a majority claimed that foundations courses are not intended to instill any discrete pedagogical expertise per se. As most viewed it, the goal is neither simply to describe education nor to urge specific school reforms but to help students to analyze and understand various issues, trends, and problems.

Additionally, it was found that in public institutions, only 40% of professors who teach foundations courses received their highest degree in that field of instruction. For private institutions, the percentage was even lower--21%--making for a combined weighted average of 29%. Hence, in an "average" school, college, or department of education, chances would be less than one in three that a faculty member teaching a course in education foundations actually majored in the field at the graduate level. Several considerations probably account for this situation, not the least among them, perhaps, being a widespread belief that practically anyone can teach a foundations of education course.

If the "life space" constraints in undergraduate teacher education are exceedingly stringent, the competition for time, place, and attention among the foundational components of preparatory programs is, if anything, now acute. Reflective of the same specialization that is common in other fields,

scholars in foundations tend to resist the tendency to compress courses that is evidenced by interdisciplinary "social foundations of education" courses where depth is sacrificed for scope or breadth of content coverage. Particularly at larger teacher-preparation institutions discipline-oriented specialists constantly vie for what they consider their rightful and essential place in programs. Educational philosophers insist that all prospective educators should have an adequate grounding in their discipline before being loosed upon the public schools. Historians of education are equally reluctant to leave initiates bereft of some meaningful historical perspective. Sociologists of education likewise lament the alleged neglect of their subject matter. Comparativists wax indignant over teacher-candidates' innocence of any cross-cultural understanding of educational phenomena. There is consensus only on the point that a single multidisciplinary "invertebrate" is insufficient and that additional foundation coursework should not be deferred until teachers return for graduate training.

What Next for Foundations Courses?

What of the future? If the foundations are given a necessarily limited place as only one among several component elements in teacher education, can they survive? Even thrive? If the now-fashionable positivist ideology persists in predominating in teacher education, if public demands for accountability encourage reliance upon reductionist methodology to define and then solve questions of pedagogical technique and evaluation, and if efficiency-productivity criteria continue to control organizational management, the foundations of education will languish. They will be consigned to the periphery of teacher preparation as a vestigial atavism or consigned to a purely ceremonial role that is in no real sense "foundational" to anything else.

Alternatively, there is a possibility that educational foundations will retain their place in teacher education or even achieve still greater importance. Already there are indications that foundational scholars are beginning (albeit reluctantly) to recognize the political character of many decision-making processes controlling teaching-education curricula, and are organizing themselves for action accordingly. State and national organizations in the field are taking an increasingly activist role vis-à-vis accrediting agencies and state departments of education, working to protect, if not enlarge, the mandated foundational component in preparatory programs. No longer content to rely on collegial courtesy or to exist at the sufferance of their fellow teacher educators, many foundations specialists have taken an active rather than purely reactive role in pressing for more and higher quality foundations coursework as an integral element in teacher preparation.

Political considerations aside, there may be some excellent professional reasons why the role of the foundations will remain important. But major reforms will be needed.

1. Foundations scholars will have to stop viewing themselves as ephemeral figures floating on the periphery of schools and colleges of education. They will have to become active co-participants with all their colleagues in teacher education. They will need to explore ways to teach cooperatively with colleagues in special education, administration, and counseling. More fruitful cross-departmental inquiry will become crucial. New courses will have to be devised. Some faculty members may need to resist the centrifugal forces of specialized scholarship and refrain from the minute inspection of issues and problems that are entirely internal to an area of academic inquiry. In short, they may need to become, some of them, less "academic" and more "relevant," in the sense that real-life issues animating public controversy debate come to furnish the initial point of departure for inquiry.

2. Foundational teaching and research will have to change. As other educators have observed many times before, the most effective teacher is one who makes complex ideas intelligible. Foundational studies should be jargon free, accessible to colleagues, other professionals, and lay persons. Simplicity of explanation, clarity of expression, and cogency in the delivery of ideas should be the goals of all foundational teaching. If concepts of power, rewards, organizations, evaluation, and equality are to be helpful, they must be stated crisply, germanely, and with verve. Unfortunately, many articles in the foundations professional journals are incomprehensible to anyone who is not a social scientist, philosopher, or historian. If the truth were to be stated simply, many of these writings deal with themes that are trivial and redundant. In the future, foundational studies will have to demystify the specialized language and pet themes of the professionals, expose the elitism built into certain professional groupings around arcane vocabulary, and seek persistently to recast and restate what is turgid and imprecise. Collaborative research and scholarship with colleagues in other departments may clarify and exemplify ideas and give them the test of reality.

3. Foundational experiences must require students and colleagues to enlarge their conventional views of teaching and learning. What foundations scholars have done well in the past is to analyze the theoretical intricacies of the teaching and learning acts that occurred in formal school environments. They have effectively demonstrated the need for sound pedagogical theories and the myriad ways in which theory and practice intimately affect each other. Now they must help professionals to understand that teaching is a central component in all helping relations. Whether social worker, minister, counselor, or administrator, each first must be a skilled teacher. Of course, to demonstrate the teaching dimension of all helping relations requires an understanding that those in foundational areas are also teachers. And here they will be credible only if they carry on zestfully and skillfully those day-to-day functions of teaching they have usually devalued: advising, counseling, improving instruction, clarifying values, and setting program policy in addition

to their usual roles of analysts, critics, and dispensers of ideas.

One way to enlarge the conventional views of professional educators is to help them to look carefully at new metaphors of thinking, acting, teaching, and helping. This task requires on-site observations in various social service institutions and in-depth studies of the arts, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. Adult educators, nurses, lawyers, television directors, politicians, and parents should become potential "educational" models for the study of teaching. Developing new ways of looking at who the teachers are, where they work, and what they believe should be a high priority for all foundational faculties.

4. All teacher-educators (including foundations persons) will have to re-affirm our essentially humanistic outlook. Traditionally, foundations studies have helped students to acquire ideas and information. What they have ignored has been the personal meaning of learning. Today, all of us in education struggle to reconcile the needs of our organizations with our personal needs. Many forces threaten individual freedom, the most powerful being governmental authoritarianism, multinational corporate expansion, and the increasing use of mind control drugs and behavior modification techniques. We must, all of us, help our students and colleagues to sort out the ethical complexities in these societal conflicts and to become aware of the insidious threats to personal freedom in our own institutions. In brief, we must function as humanistic helpers, encouraging our colleagues and students to say "no" to prevailing antihuman views and "yes" to themselves. If we are to be joyful and productive professionals, each one of us must discover the precarious state of creative tension that exists between ourselves and our institutions.

I am optimistic. Already there are signs of a possible reintegration in teacher education, a synthesis in which foundational studies are vital: In the aftermath of so much criticism levied against present-day teacher-education programs from all quarters, growing skepticism on the value of competency-based teacher-based education (CBTE) in all its variant forms, and dawning appreciation of the complexity of teaching and learning phenomena, many teacher educators have come to endorse the foundational component as a much-needed ingredient in the professional development of tomorrow's educators. Lawrence Cremin summed it up some time ago in the following statement:

Education is too significant and dynamic an enterprise to be left to mere technicians, and we might as well begin now the prodigious task of preparing men and women who understand not only the substance of what they are teaching, but also the theories behind the particular strategies they employ to convey that substance.³

³L. A. Cremin. The genius of American education. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1965.

I, for one, reject the oft-repeated claim that teacher education, like the railroads, is a declining industry. As long as there are learners to learn and teachers to help them learn, the need will exist to understand and nurture the process by which teachers prepare themselves for their helping roles. I have scant patience with those people who appeal to pure scholarship as an excuse for failing to engage what Charles Pierce once termed "the pressing questions of the day."

Not all academic inquiry need find immediate application. Not all scholarship must represent a species of applied problem solving. But, ultimately, foundational teacher educators have a unique opportunity to help to link theory and practice, problem and solution, issue and applied understanding. It would be a tragedy of the first order if this opportunity were missed.

A Time to Move for Quality in Teacher Education

Dale Scannell

University of Kansas

To have assigned to me the topic, "A Time to Move for Quality in Teacher Education," Professor Reynolds must have accepted at least three premises: (a) Now is an appropriate time to seek major revisions in teacher education which promise to improve the capabilities of graduates from our programs. (b) Improvement in teacher education is needed. (c) We are capable of accomplishing just that--achieving a higher quality of programs for prospective teachers.

There is a fourth premise, it seems to me, and I shall take full responsibility for it. This topic would not have been on the agenda for the DGP meeting if all of us agreed that a move for quality were needed and that now is the time for that move. If we had reached consensus on those points, we would not have to consider the question of whether now is the time; rather, we would focus on how it should be done.

Thus, I see my role as an advocate who must try to convince those educators who are skeptics that the time is propitious, that a move is needed, and that we have the tools required to bring off a move for quality. Many topics could have been assigned about which my feelings are vague or ambiguous, but I know how I feel about this one and I am pleased to act as an advocate for something I believe the experience of DGPs has placed forcefully before us as an unfinished agenda item.

For many of us who are from fields other than special education, the establishment of the Dean's Grant program and the passage of Public Law 94-142 called to our attention a relatively narrow program requirement and provided a relatively small amount of money to assist us in making some program changes. We accepted the challenge and the money in good faith and proceeded along various paths to modify curricula for teachers who would be teaching in LRE schools. We shared information, learned from each other, and, perhaps,

Dr. Scannell is Dean of the School of Education.

made the task easier, at least better conceptualized and defined, for those who entered the arena at some later time.

The early years of the DGPs established one fact rather quickly: The task before us was not simple. The real needs could not be met by adding one course to our curriculum. As we reviewed, planned, field-tested, evaluated, and so forth, we learned that the modifications required specifically because of the presence of exceptional children in the mainstream had far-reaching implications for the total teacher-education curriculum. Projects that focused on a specific part of the school's clientele provided a mechanism, a vehicle, indeed an imperative for review of the entire teacher-education program.

Dean's Grant Projects very clearly have resulted in curricular changes that have improved teacher-education programs. That being the case, then why was the topic on the agenda for this last meeting of DGPs? If we have already effected improvements, why must we consider the need to move for quality? There are several reasons why this topic is timely and important. Although many institutions now have fairly well institutionalized a least restrictive environment curriculum, the accomplishments lead a fragile life. A dissonance, a tension, still exist. The present curricula are not well-designed, complete, or well-integrated and firmly established sets of experiences. The DGPs have clearly established that our curricula do not represent a sufficient and satisfactory professional program for those teacher candidates who will face the challenges of our current schools.

During the past 50 years, since the prevailing model for teacher education evolved from the normal school to the four-year baccalaureate program, we have been trying to squeeze into the 4-year package all that is necessary to educate a prospective teacher: the arts and sciences that are the mark of a well-educated person, the depth in a field or several fields that are to be taught by the soon-to-be teacher, and the professional content and experiences needed to develop skills. In 1976 the AACTE publication, Educating a Profession, and in 1980 the NSSP document, A Common Body of Practice, articulated some aspects of a curriculum needed to educate high-quality, effective, professional teachers. How many of us can say that our programs, even with the changes we have made because of DGPs, meet the challenges posed by those two documents? My guess is, not many.

Fifty years ago most children went to school in the communities of their births. The mores of each community were relatively monolithic and understood and accepted by most citizens. Most children grew up in homes with two parents, one of whom was at home to greet the child at the end of the school day. The responsibilities of the school were relatively narrow and focused on academic subjects. Teachers were among the best educated members of the community and were respected as learned people.

Today our population has great mobility. It is unusual for a child to

attend school in the same district from kindergarten through Grade 12. Most communities have populations representing a variety of life styles and value systems. The church, the community, and even the family provide less structure for youth and less nurturance. Many children live with single parents or with parents who are experiencing second or third marriages. Schools have broad curricula, including topics such as drug and alcohol abuse, health education, career education, economic education, and parent education. Schools have become instruments of social change, instruments for the implementation of public policy. These functions are not bad; the point is, teacher responsibilities have been broadened as have school roles. But teachers are still educated to a large extent in a model that is 50 years old, a model that has not evolved in step with the rest of society.

If we and the general public were satisfied with the quality of teachers entering the field, there would not be the present flurry of activity across the states to legislate or mandate more stringent standards for entrance into teacher-education programs and for initial certification. Similarly, if teachers were prepared adequately to assume responsibility for their continued professional development, there would not be the present level of attention to inservice programs and recertification requirements. In all other professions, continuing programs of professional development represent very largely an updating of new findings in those topics included in the pre-service program. But in education, post-baccalaureate professional development largely represents topics we did not cover in the pre-service program. In other words, we are running deficit programs. To quote Reynolds, our standards are being set by external groups who doubt our ability to set them for ourselves. And to paraphrase Gilhool, do we chose to act on our responsibilities or do we choose to be acted upon by others?

Yes, there is a need to move for quality, and that movement has many dimensions: higher admission standards, more complete programs, more stringent certification standards, beginning teacher programs, better conditions in the workplace, and more adequate compensation for teachers. We can have an influence on all of these factors, some more directly than others. I think we need to pay immediate and serious attention to those over which we exert direct control and to join with other segments of the profession and the public in addressing the issues that are beyond our scope alone.

Another premise I attribute to Reynolds relates to our ability to establish high-quality programs. Yes, we do have the ability, the expertise, to design and implement high-quality teacher-education programs. But everyone does not agree with that assertion. Signals in several parts of the country reflect a belief that teacher education is not necessary. Perhaps you have seen reference to plans for recruiting teachers from the ranks of arts and sciences graduates. The apprenticeship approach to preparing teachers is not new but there are small pockets of renewed interest in it.

I believe that we could design and implement high-quality programs. I am not so sanguine about the question of whether we are willing to pay the price required to do it. Look at the nature of the standards we impose on ourselves through the NCATE process: We need to have admission and retention processes; no standard is set, only that we need to have explicit statements of what we do require; we need to provide practicum and student teaching (how much and what kind are not specified); we need to evaluate our graduates but we do not have to demonstrate that they are competent to meet their actual school responsibilities. We impose on ourselves standards that are primarily process oriented, not quality oriented or substantively demanding. Are we willing as a profession to adopt high standards of quality and bite the bullets that will result? Are we willing to tell the hand-signal tugboats among our 1300 programs that if they are not up to state of the art they should get out of the business? The knowledge base we need for high-quality programs exists; it requires synthesizing and refinement, but we already know much more than we include in teacher-education programs. What we have accomplished in DGPs is one small piece of evidence that we are capable of revising programs and improving their comprehensiveness. But this leads to the third premise: Is now the time to undertake a major effort in the search for quality?

Over the past few years, there is one question I wish I had asked more frequently and pushed harder for an answer. That question is, when is the right time to move for quality? In all too many meetings with colleagues over the past five years or so, when I have espoused my crazy notions, a very common reaction has been the statement: Now isn't the right time. I would like to ask: When are the conditions appropriate? Will those conditions somehow just magically appear? How will we know that the heavens are in the appropriate alignment? When is the right time?

In answer to that question 10 years ago, I said, 1972. Five years ago I said, 1977. Three years ago, I said 1979 was the right time. Today, in 1982, I say again, now is the right time. But I have to admit that in 1980, after saying now is the time I added the caveat: but time is running out on us. It was then and it is now. There is now even less sand in the top half of the hour glass for us.

In the past people thought me naive for asserting that the time was right for a push for space to accommodate a high-quality program. Now, perhaps even more than in earlier times, you may claim that this is a terrible time to think about developing more comprehensive, more demanding programs. Look around: Teacher education is fighting for its life in many institutions. Higher education in many states is suffering from the shortfall of state revenues.

I am tempted to respond merely, this too will pass. But other more substantive responses are possible. Clearly, something is happening or soon will happen to teacher education in nearly all institutions. Do we want to have

some influence on our destiny? Or do we want to take a defensive stance and hope for the best? If teacher-education program budgets were fat, we would have more to fear from retrenchment activities. But, as Orr and Peseau¹ have shown so graphically, our level of funding is miserably low and our teaching loads are high in comparison to other units on our campuses.

A penchant of all higher education in this country is for paying lip service to excellence. I think we in teacher education are in a better survival position pushing for quality than we are in a holding action. I believe a commitment to improvement can lead to a better quality of student applicant, more favorable treatment on campus, and, eventually, improved conditions in the workplace.

The right time to initiate a major effort for excellence in teacher education is when the following several conditions exist:

1. Evidence that current programs are inadequate, that graduates from our programs cannot meet the expectations of society or fulfill the principles to which we pay homage.
2. A knowledge base to justify significant changes in program content.
3. The need for new teachers should be possible to satisfy even as we make our programs more stringent.
4. The potential benefit to society should justify the increased costs of the revised program.

All these conditions are met now and, thus, now is the appropriate time to move toward high-quality teacher education.

In the midst of all the criticisms of education that have been directed at teacher education, there is a growing amount of support for us. It would be a serious mistake to fail to recognize and take advantage of that support. Let me cite just a sample. First, from a most unlikely source, the Council for Basic Education recently published a statement indicating the need for teacher-education programs to be given the support necessary for high-quality programs. Then there are the statements from the presidents of Stanford University and University of California, Berkeley about the importance of schools of education to the welfare of K-12 education. Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, has advocated the improvement of education, conditions in schools, and quality of teachers. Recently, Representative Paul Simon introduced a resolution through the House Committee for Post-Secondary Education calling on states to establish commissions on teacher excellence, to review teacher-education programs, state program approval processes, and certification standards. Of course, a year ago Secretary Bell (U.S. Department of Education) established a Commission on Excellence at the national level, and teacher education is one focus

¹B. Peseau & P. Orr, The outrageous underfunding of teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, Oct. 1980, pp. 100-102.

of the commission.

Other reasons why now is the time to move for quality include the following: The public is concerned about the quality of education in this country, and our efforts would be responsive to public concern. We have a knowledge base to guide us in curricular review and revision. Our enrollments are small enough so that we can provide adequate programs for current students while planning new programs for future students. And, now is the appropriate time because we cannot turn the calendar backward to when the time might have been better. Now is the time if we activate ourselves; we do not have much time left until the new wave of teacher shortages is on us. If we do not move now, we probably will not have another chance this century--if we survive at all for that long.

Our major umbrella organization, AACTE, has focused much of its recent attention on efforts related to a move for quality. Among the major task forces has been one that is providing the leadership to seek consensus in the profession on the skills and knowledge that should be guaranteed by graduation from an approved program. The task force has outlined a sequence of steps necessary to guarantee a major improvement in teacher education. (a) After reaching consensus on the skills and knowledge that should be part of all approved programs, (b) we must obtain consensus on the program content that is required to accomplish the goals of step one; (c) agreement must be reached on the minimal conditions necessary in institutions to provide a high-quality program; (d) a certification process must be developed to guarantee that recipients of initial teacher certificates have the education and demonstrate the skills to be effective teachers; and (e) program approval processes must assure that programs meet the standards required to accomplish the agreed-upon teacher-education program. Several other task forces are working on related topics.

In addition to building on the momentum in the profession, AACTE is forming coalitions with teacher organizations and lay groups to make the move toward high quality. Of course, in the final analysis, we are AACTE and our efforts, or lack thereof, are what will determine whether the Association efforts are successful.

I mentioned earlier that the DGP accomplishments on our campuses have a fragile beachhead in the academic milieu. To assure a lasting impact, I think at least two requirements must be addressed. The first already has been implied: We need to codify the characteristics essential for safe-to-practice professionals and modify programs accordingly. It would surprise me greatly if those programs could be offered within the prevailing four-year model. But if we do not obtain the time needed to offer a necessary program, many of our DGP accomplishments will wither on the curricular vine in the face of new initiatives and new demands on the time of our faculties.

The second challenge to us is to revise doctoral programs for future

teacher educators so that our graduates of the future will be capable of appropriately participating in programs that include the principles of the least restrictive environment. Faculty development has been a major aspect of the DGPs during the past seven years, but such efforts should not be required, indeed may not be possible, during the next 10 years. The best way to assure that least restrictive environment curricula remain institutionalized is to employ faculty members who were trained to offer the foundations, the assessment, the methods, and the other courses in which the principles are integral. Thus, doctorate-granting institutions will need to modify their programs so the staff-development factor we all have faced will not be required for the next generation of teacher educators.

A thoughtful review of higher education's last 30 years could be disquieting to people who like to think they have a fairly well-developed social conscience. Although we were generally neutral or tolerant, few of us were activists for social reform. Laws were required before we actively sought out minority and female representation in higher education, before we sought out the subtle negative aspects of our language and our policies, and before we recognized the isolation of those we refer to as exceptional people. If that history is indicative, one can only be skeptical about our willingness to become activists for the rightful place of teacher education in the academic sun. Our teacher-education programs will determine in part the extent to which future societies are open and accepting, valuing and capitalizing on the diversity of our society, and operationalizing programs that respond to what we refer to as the dignity and worth of each individual. It seems to me that just as the questions of minority, female, and exceptional persons have moral bases, so too does the need to prepare teachers adequately.

Gilhool said that we are the custodians of the future of American education. That is an awesome and frightening responsibility. Our experience in DGPs has led to important changes in teacher education but it also has revealed the scope of an unfinished agenda, a need to move for quality in teacher education. The challenge is to us; the time is now; who has a better reason or better preparation to lead the movement for excellence in teacher education than those of us who have worked in DGPs?

The Education of Mildly Handicapped Children and Implications for Teacher Education

Stephen Lilly

University of Illinois-Urbana

I want to share some ideas on several issues that relate to movements in regular and special education and what I believe the future may look like. In addition, I will discuss some direct implications of these movements for the kinds of things we do in teacher education and colleges of education. The topics I will cover are as follows:

1. Definitions of mainstreaming and the least restrictive environment.
2. Students who are being mainstreamed: What they are like and what false myths we hold about them.
3. The roles of the classroom teacher in mainstreaming.
4. The implications of all these topics for the content of teacher-education programs.
5. Implications for the process of teacher education.

To start, let us consider mainstreaming and the least restrictive environment.

Mainstreaming and the Least Restrictive Environment

There seems to be among special educators a growing sentiment over the last several years to toss out the word "mainstreaming." I never have believed that anything was wrong with the term. I never have believed that coining the term was a bad idea. My definition of mainstreaming will make my position better understood.

Mainstreaming should be viewed only in the context of educating students in the least restrictive environment. In fact, mainstreaming is a subset of

Dr. Lilly is the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies in the College of Education.

that larger concept which applies to all children, no matter how handicapped they are, whatever the severity or multiple nature of their problems. Basically, the concept of least restrictive environment holds that children should be educated as much as possible, as often as possible, in regular education settings where they can interact as much as possible with nonhandicapped students and the regular curriculum. Implicit in my definition--this is a very important point that sometimes we do not recognize--is the belief that the regular curriculum is a valuable set of experiences; it is not the kind of negative experience we so often see described by the media or well-known critics of the educational system. The regular education program is valuable and worth pursuing for all children.

The idea of least restrictive environment applies to all children. It applies to those who currently are being educated in special schools for the handicapped where they have no opportunity for any school-based interaction with nonhandicapped students. I firmly believe that only a very few children (we can count them on our fingers in our largest cities) need to be educated in something other than the regular school environment. And I can define very specifically who those children are: boys and girls whose life/health situation is so fragile that moving them from the place of residence to another place for schooling would endanger their lives, thus they need homebound instruction.

We have enough examples of communities that have no special schools for handicapped pupils and that educate all handicapped children in regular school environments--the more moderately and severely handicapped in special classes--which do it so successfully that they are arguments against the need for any special schooling arrangement for handicapped children. I stress this issue in defining the least restrictive environment because sometimes I believe that although we prepare people to advocate for children whom we call mildly handicapped to be educated in regular classrooms, we still produce some teachers who are not prepared to accept children with more moderate and severe handicaps in their schools or to interact with them on a daily basis.

We have a lot of people who are willing to assume that the problem of special segregated schools is going away because of the "least restrictive environment" part of Public Law 94-142. Yet I live in a state in which between 15,000 and 18,000 students are enrolled in special schools; that number has not decreased significantly since 1975. My state is not unusual. We need to talk to people about the concept of least restrictive environment as it applies to all children who are labeled handicapped.

What, then, is mainstreaming? In my view, mainstreaming has to do with educating children for all or part of the school day in the regular classroom with the regular curriculum, with students who have not been labeled handicapped. It has to do with the notion that we have been far too separative in our services for the children whom we might call learning disabled or educable mentally retarded or behavior disordered, or children who have visual,

hearing, or speech impairments; that far too often we have decided what kinds of services to offer these children on the basis of what is available, not what is best. We have prescribed the pull-out models we have in place rather than the integrated models that must be developed. So if we view mainstreaming as educating children in regular classrooms, if we accept the notion that we have in the past separated children from regular classroom environments when the situation did not demand it because of the services available, then the concept of mainstreaming is completely acceptable to me and I do not see any reason to apologize for it or to call for its abolition.

Another common view is that mainstreaming means putting children back into regular classrooms. In the short run this view is reasonable because a lot of children who were referred out should systematically be returned to regular classrooms and provided supportive services there. Ultimately, however, the concept of mainstreaming is not concerned primarily with the idea of "putting children back"; it centers on not removing children in the first place. Mainstreaming applies to the point of referral where the decisions are made; mainstreaming focuses on providing the kind of services that will make the classroom more accommodative and will help the classroom teacher to make the adjustments necessary to accept and successfully teach handicapped children. We will be better off, five or 10 years from now, when we no longer are in the business of "putting students back" who are wrongfully removed in the first place but, rather, are in the business of building special education systems that will provide supports for keeping children in the regular classrooms from the start. That is the true meaning of mainstreaming.

Is mainstreaming a fad? That is another view we hear frequently. The history of mainstreaming does not begin in 1975 with the passage of Public Law 94-142. It can be traced much further back but, in terms of a real movement in education, we must look to the early and mid-1960s. If we consider the number of students who were served at least partially in regular classrooms, beginning in the mid-1960s, we see a rising curve, an increasing slope. There was no dramatic change in the trend around 1975, 1976, 1977; what we have is a movement in education that is now 15-20 years old. For me, that does not define a fad. It defines a long, gradual change of thinking and a change in the way of serving children. I expect the trend to continue into the foreseeable future.

Who are the Mainstreamed Children?

Let me offer two views of the population of children who are served in mainstream programs, the first, to define the population of children we serve, and the second, to define special education instructional interventions and the nature of those interventions.

By and large, when we talk about mainstreaming we are talking about students who have been labeled "educable mentally retarded," "learning disabled,"

or "behavior disordered." They are referred by classroom teachers because (a) they are not learning at a sufficient rate in the classroom, (b) they are not behaving well within the standards of the classroom, or, commonly, (c) because of a combination of the first two reasons. These students, once referred, are then taken through a diagnostic process which has been designed by special educators and school psychologists on the basis of one absolute assumption: If there is a problem in that classroom, the problem resides in the child. The diagnostic process in special education does not test classrooms, does not test peers, does not test teachers; it tests children. And it tests children in ways that are designed to apply a label to each and to make them eligible for available services. In fact, although we can say that the IEP is the "ticket" for special education services, we also must admit that the label is the "ticket" to the IEP, and without that "ticket" the child is not going to get special education services. This is understandable because right now in virtually all states the law requires a label if the school district is to receive any funding from the state for providing special education services. However, the definition of the problem as "in the child" is also an incredibly naive view of the situation.

The fact is that the three common categories of exceptionality have not been with us for that long. From the beginning of the written history of man, we can find descriptions of children who were moderately or severely retarded, severely emotionally disturbed, blind, deaf, and so on. We cannot find references to children who are educable mentally retarded or learning disabled. In fact, the category of educable mental retardation came into existence only in the early part of this century, although it was not called that then. At that time there were two categories of mental retardation: "idiots" or "imbeciles," which more or less corresponded to "trainable mentally retarded" and severely/profoundly retarded. Then, in the early part of this century, three things happened; in my view they led to a change in our school system and in the types of categories of exceptionality that we recognize. Those three things were (a) the advent of compulsory education and mass education, which our society took seriously; (b) child labor laws that kept children out of the factories so that schooling for many families became a new alternative, given that the children could no longer contribute to the family finances; and (c) some people in France were asked to develop a test that would predict school achievement; it was mistakenly named an "intelligence test" and unfortunately translated into English and standardized on American populations. Thus, increasing numbers of students attended schools that offered a curriculum which was designed for the children of the elite. This new student population consisted largely of poor children, many of whom did not do well in school. When they had problems, we had a test to give them that would tell us that the reason they were not doing very well was that they were not very smart. I have never considered intelligence tests to measure intelligence. I consider them to test achievements, achievements that bear a remarkable resemblance to the kinds of things children are expected to do in school. In fact, intelligence

tests represent the beginning of using diagnostic testing procedures to place the problem in the child. In the early part of the century, a new category of children was established: "morons." It is the equivalent of today's category of educable mental retardation. This category grew slowly but consistently until the late 1950s and early 1960s, when the number of special classes for children labeled EMR exploded in this country. Many people say that the expansion in the number of children served resulted from (a) better state legislation supporting these programs, and (b) federal recognition of the importance of the field of mental retardation because President Dwight Eisenhower was closely associated with Pearl Buck and President John Kennedy had a retarded sister. If we are going to be honest with ourselves we must admit to one other factor that had a big role in the expansion of these classes: the 1954 *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision by the U.S. Supreme Court. Just as the mass education movement in the early part of the century brought into the schools children who had never been there before, so the 1954 decision brought into certain schools large numbers of poor, black children who had never been seen there before. Faced with this influx, the system reacted. One way was to find reasons for removing children from the standard school environment. To this day we are plagued with disproportionate numbers of minority children in special EMR classes, which is not surprising when you look at the history of the development of the services.

In the mid-1960s the field of learning disabilities came along. I see it as more of a reaction to the field of EMR and the direction that it was developing than anything else. The fact is that there is not a lot of debate in the field of special education right now about whether the three labels--EMR, LD, and behavior disorders--are useful for instructional purposes. Not many people believe they are. The kinds of defenses offered for using the labels have more to do with the politics of keeping money for special education services and with the ease of getting money from states. In my view, those labels also build barriers between regular and special education because they reinforce the notion that something is wrong with the children and it takes specialists to fix it. We had a major project in Champaign over the last couple of years which put large numbers of children labeled EMH back into regular classrooms with supportive help. The classroom teachers had a lot of worries and questions before it happened but by and large they were pleasantly surprised afterwards to find that for the most part the children fit into existing instructional groupings in the classrooms. They were not that different from other children in the room behaviorally or academically. For years the notion had been reinforced that these children were substantially different. I call that the "gap" theory: We have a given range of ability and skills in the classroom and then there is a gap at the bottom and we have those students who receive special education; and we say that these children are qualitatively different because they cannot possibly benefit from the kinds of instructional interventions we use for the students in the regular

program. Our labeling system reinforces this theory although it is not true. Now, more and more of us are ready to admit that it is not true.

Roles of Classroom Teachers

Let us consider my preceding observations in terms of the roles of classroom teachers in mainstreaming situations. I see four major roles which they must play.

1. They must be given the opportunities to be functioning members of the educational teams that make decisions on services for children. I distinguish between a requirement to participate and having the opportunity to participate meaningfully. We continually run into two types of situations: (a) Where the teachers are not involved although they are supposed to be and (b) the teachers are involved but are expected to take a passive role. There is ample evidence to indicate that teachers are not by and large active members of staffing teams and that the people who bring in data other than classroom performance data seem to dominate these meetings. I take every available opportunity to point out that information gathered in the classroom should carry more weight in decision making than data gathered by someone who has spent an hour with the child outside the regular classroom. This is an idea that we can teach to people in an inservice or pre-service setting, and I find that classroom teachers are relieved to hear this said because they knew it was true all along, however differently the system operated. I encourage classroom teachers not to become the writers of IEPs (the last thing a classroom teacher needs to be is the primary writer of IEPs) but to work very closely with the primary writers, not just at the IEP meeting but prior to the IEP meeting. What happens before you get to the meeting is usually more important; the meeting, in terms of writing an IEP, is often window dressing. Everybody knows you cannot write a document like an IEP at a meeting; it either happens before or following the meeting, and wherever the key point is, that is where the teacher needs to be involved.

2. The classroom teacher should be an instructional manager or, in plain terms, a teacher of academic skills. One of the things that has been advocated for a number of years is a more direct-instruction, data-based model for teaching children. We special educators have developed a number of specialized teaching strategies: perceptual motor and visual perception approaches for teaching "learning disabled" children; special curriculum for children labeled "EMR"; and a variety of instructional models for children labeled "behavior disorders." So far we have not found that any of those models produce substantially better results over the long run and over large numbers of children than the instruction provided in regular classrooms. Now does that mean that we do not need to differentiate instruction in the classroom? No, children are not referred for special education unless they are having problems with the teaching methods being used in the classrooms. What it means is that when

problems occur we do not necessarily need to seek out the specialized instructional techniques of special education, and especially not those techniques based on the assumption that the problem really is not that the child can't read but that he or she has some kind of processing dysfunction that won't allow him or her to read. There is little or no evidence that remediation in areas of processing dysfunction increase academic performance. So with assessment: There is no evidence that children who are having academic problems need to be given a full battery of tests--the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, the Bender Visual Gestalt, and others--to find out what the "real problem" is. To me, the most exciting work in special education for the mildly handicapped over the past 10 years is in two areas: curriculum-based assessment, which focuses on assessing children in terms of what is expected of them in the regular curriculum and looking at how they function in relation to these expectations; and direct instruction, which is the most direct remedial route to teach these needed skills. I have termed our emphasis on these two areas the "rediscovery of regular curriculum in special education." We have good evidence now from a number of places that children who have been labeled handicapped can, through direct instructional models, make anywhere from a two-to-four month gain per month of instruction in academic areas. Two to four months of gain per month of instruction! The people in Vermont have been talking for years not about providing remedial instruction that will help students to hold their own and not fall any farther behind but, rather, about what rate of progress is necessary for these students to catch up to where they should be in the regular curriculum. We are making dramatic gains for students by going directly to the source of the problem and providing strong instructional techniques. This practice, of course, brings down many barriers between regular and special education. I worked with many regular classroom teachers when I spent three years at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, and one thing I tried to impress upon them was that if you try something that doesn't work, your best source of help in identifying alternatives is not found in a book or an "expert" from outside but next door. What you need is to gather ideas on how other teachers have tried to solve these problems; you do not need to delve into theories about what is wrong with the child and how can my intervention be tailored to what is wrong with the child.

3. The teacher should be a behavior manager. This is the constant number one request of teachers when we ask them to list priorities for inservice education. Sometimes we assume this response to mean that teachers need help with one child who is acting out in one way or another, and many times this assumption is correct. However, I also hear teachers asking for help organizing the classroom to make it a productive place. Overall classroom management is a very important area to teachers' functioning and we need to provide them with real help. We must divest ourselves of the notion that special educators are a group of strident behaviorists who know only one method for dealing with

classroom behavior problems. Yes, most special educators are behavioral in orientation, but I think we are seeing a different view of behaviorism developing among them. I do not see the flaming arguments that used to be carried on 10 years ago between the behaviorists and the non-behaviorists. People in special education talk about cooperative learning and cognitive behavior management, which focuses on teaching children how to think and how to control their behavior themselves through self-control techniques. Exciting things are happening that are giving special educators new perspectives. One reason is that not only are regular educators learning more about special education but, also, special educators are learning more about regular educators and what has been happening in regular education for a good period of time.

4. Classroom teachers must be student and program advocates. I try to convince classroom teachers that they are consumers of services, and that special education is a service which they are buying. It is not a matter of what do we have available, with teachers expected to gratefully accept any help. Rather, teachers are entitled to help in solving problems within their boundaries. I encourage classroom teachers, for example, to go into staffings expecting that if they ask for help in solving a classroom problem, they will get that help, not removal of the child. The problem with many staffings is that the only kinds of services that are considered are those that are currently available, which often means "pull out" services in which the child but not the teacher gets the help. I am convinced that teachers must become much more assertive in their role of consumers of special education services, especially in asking for and demanding the help they need.

Implications for Teacher Education

What are some of the implications of the four roles for teacher education programs? In my view, the people with whom we deal in pre-service programs should develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are not uniquely special education in nature. Instructional models need to be taught, and much of what we want to infuse in teacher-education curricula will not be all that identifiable as "special education." As people adopt infusion models, it is important to avoid too much identification of new material and content with "special education." We need to prepare teachers to engage in differentiated instruction and to think about children as though their skills and abilities and how they approach their school work constitute continua, and not only to expect to see children on this continuum but, also, to be able to deal with them effectively. This is quite different from teaching prospective teachers "10 characteristics of learning disabled children"; sometimes that can get in our way instead of helping.

Knowledge, skills, and attitudes. It is in the knowledge area that we find what is the unique special education content to be taught. However, let me make a caveat in terms of what we seem to be teaching people. I believe

that the single most widely used phrase in special education manuscripts, term papers, and dissertations today, and it usually occurs right at the beginning, is the phrase, "Since the enactment of Public Law 94-142...." Whenever I see those words in a paper I cross them out. It is true that we need to stress the law to a certain extent but we should not create difficulties for ourselves by leading prospective teachers to believe that mainstreaming emanates from that law; it is simply not true. It scares me to see what is happening at the federal, state, and local levels, as a result of our having stressed to people, "You have to do this because of the law." In fact, we were moving on the road toward mainstreaming for 10 years before the law came into existence. In my view Public Law 94-142 reflects what had already happened in educational and legal circles. The law broke very little new ground. About the only new provision in the law was the IEP; other than that, most states already were requiring, in general, the kind of practices that are incorporated in the law.

We do need, however, to teach prospective teachers about referral procedures and how they are used, and about state regulations governing special education. I spend more time talking with people about state regulations and what they say about how we must operate than federal regulations because the people in the school district who provide services spend a lot more time worrying about meeting state than federal regulations. I try to be sure that people know which tests have to be given and which not in order to place students in special education services, and the time lines within which evaluations must be made. I find that most people are surprised--even people in the schools--when they learn that in the state of Illinois you do not have to give a child an intelligence test to put him in LD services; the assumption is that one must be given, but the regulations do not require it and, therefore, the two-three-month wait for services--waiting for the formal testing to be done--is not necessary. We can deliver services much more quickly and efficiently than we often do.

It is also imperative in the area of knowledge that we help people to understand the social context in which all these activities occur. Sometimes we seem to assume that various things are happening in education independently of each other. I shared with you earlier some of the social context for the development of EMR services. I think it is important for people to know this information as background, and to analyze why things are happening as they are right now. What is it in our society that is producing change? Frankly, I believe that unless we have today a notion of the social context of providing special education services, we have difficulty imagining, understanding, or becoming rightfully indignant about the legal and regulatory changes happening at the federal level.

There are three areas in which I think prospective teachers need to

develop skills. I already have talked about two: direct assessment and direct instruction. The third is what I call "prosthetic" approaches to teaching. We see many students in the schools who have reached sixth grade and cannot read well enough to understand a social sciences textbook. Yet they are expected to learn social studies and to learn to read simultaneously. What we are sometimes saying to those students, it seems to me, is, "We will teach you the social studies material as soon as you learn to read." For example, if we pull students out of social studies to give them remedial help in reading, then we are saying, "Let content wait until we get your basic reading skills developed." In contrast, I believe we need to be prepared to deal with students who need to learn social studies even though they cannot read the book, who need to learn some applied math procedures, like budgeting and checkbook keeping, even though they still are not very good at basic math facts. In other words, we must provide some prosthetic supports for students. Thus, if the student needs to learn how to balance a checkbook but still cannot borrow in subtraction, we provide a calculator to do the subtraction and we teach budgeting using a calculator. If the student needs to learn the social studies material and cannot read the book, then let us provide either taped textbooks or highlighted textbooks or any other means with which we can come up to convey the social studies information to the student. Does that mean we give up on the reading? No, but we do it at another time of the day; we do not do it instead of the content that all the other students are learning. Sometimes I think we underplay the use of prosthetic approaches that would help students to learn.

As a corollary, if we want to know what a student knows in social studies and he or she cannot write, let us give the tests in a way that measures the student's knowledge of social studies content, not writing ability. If necessary, we should give oral tests. This gets into the supportive role of special educators.

Classroom teachers sometimes may come into staffings and say, "Here is what I need in the classroom to help the student; if you provide these things, the student will not have to be pulled out of the classroom." In the terms I used earlier, the student needs "differentiated instruction" but not necessarily "special education." What the teacher needs is help, not relief. Indeed, more and more we see special educators providing the services that classroom teachers want through consultative support. This method is appropriate inasmuch as most likely there are other students in the room who are having similar problems and who need the same kind of help from the teacher. Such help is not individualized instruction in its most complex sense, rather, it is individual attention by the teacher to the most worrisome problems encountered in the classroom.

Finally, let me mention attitudes. Despite all the behaviorism in special education I talked about earlier, I believe that attitudes are a most

important area because teacher education is above all a socializing process. In too many teacher-education programs, we have in the past taught teachers that they should expect classroom instruction to fall within a narrow band of skills, and I do not think teachers are wrong to believe what we have taught them. We need to change our expectations of teachers while we have them at the pre-service level, and we need to break the notion that education is a series of subspecialties which are more and more finely tuned and result in more and more students being removed from the responsibility of regular education. A second-grade teacher in Champaign stood up in a school board meeting one night and said, "I don't know what all the fuss is about with mainstreaming; I take the students they send me and teach them." This is the attitude we need to convey in teacher-education programs. It is not taught in a section of a class that has to do with curriculum; it must be infused throughout the program. Clearly, it is the process I prefer and the process I see working. In my view, the most effective Dean's Grant Projects have been those that have made slower progress, not by substituting information within the curriculum but, rather, by working with the curriculum itself, trying to establish change in the very fabric of the teacher-education program.

Conclusion

I want to make three points.

1. There is a need to look at whether many of the services we are currently providing through special education rightfully should be provided by special educators or by the regular education system. I am talking about the indirect and tutorial services that we provide in areas like LD, ED, and EMR. I believe that over the next several years we will see some renegotiation in this area. I hope that we see a rebuilding of the regular education remedial and supportive services that used to exist before learning disabilities came into existence. In my view, the development of the field of learning disabilities had the effect not only of serving some children who were not served before but, also, of supplanting some existing regular education supportive services and calling them special education. When I worked in Duluth, I spent three years working with inservice special education LD teachers who were not certified for their current positions; I estimate that 90 percent of these people were ex-remedial reading teachers. They became LD teachers when the LD legislation was passed at the state level, and the reason they became LD teachers by and large was that if they were called LD the district got state help in paying their salaries. If they were called remedial reading, the district paid all of their salaries out of local funds. It is hard to find regular education remedial supportive services currently, and in most cases, they were supplanted by LD services.

A related problem is that we have developed for the protection of children a very complex diagnostic and placement procedure in special education

that can take a long time to bring to fruition. For example, in the state of Illinois, the school district has 60 school days, from the day of referral to the day of the staffing, in which to get the diagnostic work done. Sixty school days is three to four months of real time. So if a teacher who has a problem with a student and needs help makes the referral in October, perhaps in January or February some help will come, and most likely that help will come by pulling the child out of the room for tutoring somewhere else. This is not the way good supportive services should be organized and offered. However, as long as the services are under special education, this procedure probably will be necessary because we have to protect students against existing discriminatory diagnostic practices in special education. I believe that we will renegotiate some of those supportive services and I hope that we can change current practice in which up to 25-30 percent of the students in the school system are receiving some kind of "pull out" service. This renegotiation has a number of implications, for example, for how much regular education perceives that it owns and takes responsibility for.

2. When I look at the Dean's Grant Projects and the time that they have existed, and what they have done, the most significant thing to me is the increased commitment to and knowledge of special education among our college leadership nationally. Among deans of colleges of education, special education no longer comprises that mysterious group of people who are off on their own and doing their own thing and are best left alone. The leaders of colleges of education in this country increasingly are taking responsibility for special education, taking ownership of special education, and seeing it as integral to the total education program at the college. This is a beautiful development. It will lead to better and better understanding between regular and special education: understanding going both ways.

3. My final point: Many times at meetings we talk about how to prepare regular educators for what is coming; please--let's also talk about how to prepare special educators for what is coming. There are a lot of special educators in the field and enrolled in preparatory programs who do not know very much about regular education. Many inservice special educators have not been in regular classrooms for a long time, if ever. Many pre-service special educators are being prepared for certification without concurrent certification in regular education. We have to go both ways in terms of the knowledge and the attitudes that must be developed. We cannot assume that the barriers to mainstreaming lie only in the heads of regular educators; rather, we must examine the possessiveness with which we sometimes view "our" children, and the types of services that we have offered. When the Champaign school district declassified about 70% of all EMH children and put them back in regular classrooms, the group of people who were most negative, who said it could not be done, were the EMH special class teachers. If we do not deal with the need for information, exchange of information, and better understanding going

both ways, then I fear we will reach the point where we have a regular education system that is receptive and a special education system that is not ready to let go.

Perspectives on the Status and Future of Special Education and Regular Education¹

Edward Sontag

U.S. Department of Education

Three current issues confronting the field of special education are addressed in this paper. The three issues obviously do not exhaust the possibilities, nor are they necessarily the most important. However, they do have particular meaning to individuals who have been involved with the Dean's Grant Projects. The first two issues - the relation between special education and regular education and quality programing in teacher education - are reasonably general; they affect the entire field of teacher training. The third issue - the future of the Dean's Grants - is somewhat more circumscribed but has important implications in terms of long-range effects.

The Relation between Special Education and Regular Education

The federal government and, particularly, the Congress, has demonstrated a continuing interest in the preparation of personnel in the area of special education. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, the Congress initiated legislation to support training programs for educators of deaf and mentally handicapped children. These early efforts subsequently were expanded to include related service personnel, regular educators, paraprofessionals, volunteers, and parents.

In part, this expansion of programs at the federal level was a response to the demand for services for an increasing population of children who were identified as handicapped. This growth was a result of two major occurrences. (a) As a result of Public Law 94-142, a large number of severely handicapped children who previously were excluded from education programs began to receive services. (b) A major increase occurred in the number of children served in some traditional areas, particularly learning disabilities. Indeed, even with

Dr. Sontag is Director, Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

¹James E. Button and George Hagerty, Senior Program Officers in Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education, served as co-authors in the development of the oral presentation and subsequent paper.

the substantial growth in services to severely handicapped students, the preponderance of growth in both the number of students served and in teachers prepared has been in the area of service delivery to mildly handicapped students. Although program growth traditionally has been considered to be a positive indicator for a service provider, in this instance such dramatic growth generated a situation that demands a careful and thoughtful analysis. Certainly, one of the major problems that will confront special education in the next decade is the emerging controversy over the sorting out of responsibilities among remedial, regular, and special education.

Steve Lilly, in a paper prepared for The Council for Exceptional Children Convention in March 1982, suggested that regular education support systems have been supplanted by special education services. If so, it may well be attributable to the relative "softness" of the categories of learning disabilities, educable mentally retarded, and emotionally disturbed, and the difficulty in clearly distinguishing students with these impairments from typically remedial populations, such as culturally deprived, economically disadvantaged, or socially maladjusted students. Indeed, recent findings lead us to believe that the placement of children in programs for the learning disabled may not be based upon a clear indication of a handicapping condition. For example, a recent General Accounting Office Report (1981) indicated,

Congressional fears that a disproportionate share of funds might be allocated to the learning disabilities category (the magnitude of which is not clearly known or understood) seems to have been realized with the lifting of the 2 percent cap on the number of learning disabled children who can be counted for federal funding purposes. Little is known about who is being served in this category. These children may include those with mild learning problems, slow learners, and/or children who formerly would have been labeled retarded. (DIGEST, p. v)

In addition, a recent study on the identification of perceptual-communication disorders in Colorado concluded,

The single most important finding is that more than half the children do not meet either statistical or valid clinical criteria for the identification of perceptual and communicative disorders. (Sheppard & Smith, 1980, p. v)

Lilly's (1982) paper to the CEC Conference suggested actually transferring to regular education the responsibility for providing many services currently thought to be within the domain of special education. The conclusions of the General Accounting Office Report and Colorado study suggest that we need to carefully reassess the children served in special education categories in order to ascertain if some would be more appropriately served in regular education remedial programs.

Quality of Education Programing

The major categorical program growth in recent years has been in the areas of learning disabilities, educable mentally retarded, and emotional disturbance; in combination they now comprise 90% of the special education enrollment. Some years ago, Dunn (1968) questioned the appropriateness of special class placement for mildly handicapped students. As a result, a number of less restrictive mechanisms for service delivery came into wider use, particularly the resource room. Recently, a study by Bloomer, Bates, Brown, and Norlander (1982) of learning disabled children in Vermont, many of whom were served in resource rooms, indicated that from 40% to 65% (depending on subject matter) did not realize the expected benefits from special education intervention. If similar findings emerge in other instances, it may be time for more careful investigations of the effectiveness of resource room intervention strategies.

If it is the case that resource room intervention strategies are not producing the expected instructional benefits, returning students to regular education remedial programs may not be the answer either because both remedial and resource room programs are based upon a "pull-out" strategy. In addition, a recent APA Division H Task Force Report (Kennedy, 1982) on Special Education Evaluation found that programs for mildly handicapped children did not differ substantively from compensatory education programs. In fact, the Colorado report on the identification of children with perceptual-communicative disorders (PCD) found,

On [the] average between 30% and 35% of the time [in PCD classrooms] is spent on repetition and drill on basic skills and between 15% and 18% of time is spent in one-to-one tutoring with regular classroom work. Therefore, roughly half of the special instructional time for PCD pupils is spent directly on academic work. (Sheppard & Smith, 1981, p. 172)

Such indications should create some interest in closely inspecting how special education teachers spend their instructional time, what strategies they use, and which activities could be effectively carried out in regular classroom settings.

It may be reasonable to begin to explore alternative intervention strategies which, rather than pulling students out of the regular classroom, make use of inclusion concepts. These concepts can build upon the notion of importing assistance into the classroom for both student and teacher on a comprehensive and continuous basis. Inclusion concepts traditionally incorporate the idea of a "peer" or "master" teacher who provides both direct instruction and technical assistance as opposed to the "special" or "expert" teacher who often offers advice and consultation. Whatever model is chosen, teacher education must begin carefully to consider the relations among special education, remedial education, and regular education.

Regular Education Pre-Service - Status and Future

The "futures" orientation of the NSSP Annual Conference was particularly encouraging. The programmed individual meetings offered numerous opportunities to consider some issues which have been highlighted here. The Dean's Grant program has provided a mechanism for the consideration of a range of crucial educational issues and the negotiation of cooperative relations among the professionals who are responsible for the education of handicapped children and youth. The damaging regular education/special education dichotomy--the "we"- "they" phenomenon that is inherent to any system-wide change, for example, that stemming from the least restrictive environment movement--has been debated and creatively addressed in many Dean's Grant Projects.

My genuine interest in promoting future work in the area of regular education is to capitalize upon those aspects and strategies for planned change that have proven extraordinarily effective, and to diminish those aspects of the current initiative that have been less than promising. I will not generalize here because we have a fair picture of what is ahead of us over the next several years in our efforts to improve personnel preparation programing.

Over the past seven years, the Division of Personnel Preparation has supported about 260 Dean's Grant Projects under the Regular Education-Pre-service category. In assessing the collective progress of individual Dean's Grant Projects, we must reflect upon those publicly stated national program objectives contained in the 1974 BEH "Dear Colleague" announcement, incorporating the following ideas.

- . The development of instructional competencies pertinent to the education of handicapped students for regular education personnel, including "elementary educators, secondary educators, principals, supervisors, superintendents, career/vocational educators, and other personnel...."
- . The "reforming of training sequences and curricula which promote the infusion of the competencies responding to the individual challenges of children, including the handicapped, who require additional attention."
- . The establishment of projects which incorporate the following programmatic elements:
 1. Dean or equivalent administrator as the project director.
 2. A plan which proposes the revision of the teacher-education program; modification should be beyond the mere addition of one or two courses.
 3. Evidence of strong special education faculty involvement and commitment.
 4. A three-year timeline for program implementation.
 5. A delineation of project outcomes including but

not limited to changes in curricula, impact upon school/college operation, benefits to program graduates, and projected impact upon handicapped and other children "whom the program's graduates will serve."

The Dean's Grant program has been a successful endeavor to the degree that this initiative has accomplished both the explicit and implied following objectives:

- . Establishing the education of exceptional students as an area of critical attention for teacher-education institutions.
- . Promoting models for curricular refinement/modernization in teacher-education institutions by primarily focusing on special education competencies.
- . Advocating the shared-responsibility of regular and special education for the provision of services to a substantial proportion of handicapped students.

Based upon our reviews of evaluation data from numerous sources (individual grant applications, final program reports, and both field- and SEP-initiated research), it is evident that the Dean's Grant initiative has had a positive impact upon the educational community. For example:

- . Dean's Grant participants produce approximately 38% of the nation's teachers (NSSP, 1980).
- . Increasing numbers of consortium arrangements have been supported to insure an expanding impact upon smaller universities and colleges, particularly institutions serving rural populations (SEP, 1981).
- . Projects have begun to insure that professional standards related to individual differences are maintained by teacher-preparation programs. For instance, the current AACTE project is designed to provide technical assistance to teacher-education programs in meeting the standards on special education adopted by NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) (AACTE, 1981).
- . In an initial survey of recent dean's grant programming by the Teaching Research staff (1981), the following findings were documented:
 - "First-year projects appear to be off to a better and faster start when compared with earlier projects."
 - "The amount of technical and material assistance available through developed products is considerably more abundant now than it was for the early projects."
 - "Making curriculum changes and incorporating them into the degree program was the most successful and lasting part of

the former projects."

In contrast to these very positive findings, it is somewhat disquieting to note that the Teaching Research survey also found the following:

"None of the former dean's grant projects in a national survey (Teaching Research, 1981) reported to use of practicum and student teaching with handicapped students" to complement revised coursework offerings, and less than 30% of the final reports submitted to SEP by Dean's Grant recipients indicate revisions in practicum experiences. It seems to me that there should be increased efforts to reinforce coursework with relevant practica experiences.

"A substantial number of projects" (even those supported for 4-6 years) did not address the issue related to "success of graduates." This finding is particularly problematic because the ultimate objective of the major Dean's Grant components (faculty development and curriculum refinement) is the positive impact of programing upon the knowledge and skills of graduates. I am encouraged, however, that several individual programs have developed instruments and collected data on the impact of the programs on graduates over the past year, and I intend to submit this information to the DPP staff.

Our discussions on the scope and nature of future Dean's Grant programing have centered on isolating continuing areas of need. It is clear that further investment in program development is warranted in the areas of doctoral training (leadership personnel); and so is programing in historically black institutions and small colleges and universities serving rural and urban populations.

Since its inception, participants in the Regular Education Grant Program initiative have asked, "When does a Dean's Grant end?" Numerous projects have been supported for periods ranging from 4-6 years. Although SEP recognizes the complexities inherent to the institutional change process, we also recognize that Deans' Grants were originally conceptualized as catalytic agents, and not intended to be long-term federal support for the extended expansion of initial project designs. It was certainly our hope and intention that the initial faculty development and program revision activities supported by Regular Education-Preservice funds would be institutionalized by the participating university. It is my feeling that our decisions on the allowable duration of Dean's Grant Projects will be determined in the future less in response to current budget constraints than from the recognition that seven years of Regular Education-Preservice programing has generated a substantial knowledge base and cadre of experienced professionals from whom new project participants may draw programmatic support. These resources should prove extremely helpful to future projects during the initial year of operation.

Some refocusing or redefinition of the traditional Dean's Grant concept may be necessary to meet critical future needs, including the possibility of developing a revitalized master or peer-teacher system and the expansion of practical, supervised experiences with exceptional learners during the pre-service training sequence. Our initial thinking has focused on the following features:

- A truly unique program design that incorporates innovative models/activities which are related to effective teacher training, research, and local service delivery. This may be accomplished through the development of consortium models for the training of deans (or their designees) in coordination with local school officials. This training would provide those responsible for policy development and implementation within colleges, universities, and local school districts with the skills and resources necessary to effectively manage the administration of training and service delivery efforts related to the education of handicapped students.
- A detailed planning component that reflects intensive faculty and LEA involvement prior to proposal submission.
- Collaborative SEA/LEA advocacy activities.
- A delineation of the extent to which program objectives will impact upon handicapped students.
- The development of a comprehensive evaluation design that will assess project impact upon the functions of program graduates and handicapped students.

We are well aware of the impact of recommended cuts in project budgets this year. However, the level of Congressional appropriations left us with few options but to administer the reductions at the negotiated level across the board. We are appreciative that most continuation grantees are attempting to administer programs highly consistent with the original project workscope by using increased university financial commitments or voluntary staff commitments, or creatively using existing Division of Personnel Preparation funds. At this time we simply do not know what the FY 1983 budget for personnel preparation programing will be. We are, however, planning to meet all contingencies by proposing the development of a flexible DPP discretionary program composed of multiple priorities or program competitions.

In addition to a competition for the specialized training of regular education personnel, including deans, their designees, and local school officials, the following program competitions are being proposed:

- The preparation of special educators. DPP envisions projects designed to provide training for personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as special educators of handicapped children ages 0-21 years or as supervisors of such educators. The competition includes the preparation of early childhood

specialists, special educators of the handicapped, special education administrators and supervisors, speech-language pathologists, audiologists, physical educators, and vocational educators.

- The preparation of leadership personnel. DPP proposes the doctoral and post-doctoral level training of professional personnel to conduct training of teacher trainers, researchers, administrators, and other specialists.
- The preparation of related services personnel. This competition is intended to support the preparation of individuals who provide developmental, corrective, and other supportive services that may be required to assist a handicapped child to benefit from special education.
- State educational agency programing. This competition is proposed to support projects dealing with unique state-wide training in all or several of the need areas identified by the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) and may include training in management and organizational design which enhance the ability of states to provide comprehensive services to handicapped children.
- Special projects. DPP anticipates continued support for evaluation, and distribution of imaginative or innovative approaches to personnel preparation, including the development of new materials to prepare personnel to educate handicapped children.
- The preparation of trainers of volunteers, including parents. This competition is proposed to support the preparation of trainers of volunteers, including parents, to assist in the provision of educational services to handicapped students. In addition to the preparation of volunteers and parents by experienced professionals, funds from this competition may be awarded for the support of projects that emphasize the training of parents by parents.

The development of the seven competitions cited here are contingent upon the early Fall 1982 publication of proposed, revised regulations for the Part D discretionary program (84.029 Handicapped Personnel Preparation). The staff of the Division of Personnel Preparation would sincerely appreciate readers' active participation in the review and comment process which is scheduled immediately following the publication of the proposed, revised regulations.

Thank you for your continued involvement in and advocacy for the improvement of services to handicapped children and youth. I look forward to our future collaboration for the improvement of teacher education and leadership programing.

References

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. AACTE Project on the Handicapped. Washington, DC: Author, 1981.
- Bloomer, R., Bates, H., Brown, S., & Norlander, K. Mainstreaming in Vermont: A study of the identification process. Livonia, NY: Brador Publications, January 1982.
- Dunn, L. Special education for the mildly retarded - Is much of it justifiable? Exceptional Children, 1968, 35, 5-22.
- General Accounting Office. Disparities still exist in who gets special education. Washington, DC: GAO, September 30, 1981. (IPE-81-1).
- Kennedy, M. Report of the Division H Task Force on Special Education Evaluation. American Education Research Association, March 1982.
- Lilly, S. Divestiture in special education: A personnel point of view. Paper presented at the meeting of The Council for Exceptional Children, Houston, Texas, April 1982.
- National Support Systems Project. The Dean's Grant Projects: A descriptive analysis and evaluation. Minneapolis, MN: Author, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1980.
- Sheppard, L., & Smith, M. Evaluation of the identification of perceptual-communicative disorders in Colorado (Final Report). Boulder, CO: Laboratory of Educational Research, University of Colorado, February 20, 1981.
- Special Education Programs. Internal Memorandum on the Status of Dean's Grant Programming, U. S. Department of Education, 1981.
- Teaching Research. Executive Summary of the Dean's Grant Evaluation Study. Monmouth, OR: Author, 1981.

Noncategorical Special Education Teacher Preparation

A. Edward Blackhurst

University of Kentucky

Last year at the national Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) Convention, I was approached by a university student who was selling buttons. (It seems that someone is always selling buttons at CEC conventions.) These buttons read, "LABEL JARS, NOT CHILDREN." I asked the student what would be done with the proceeds of the sales. To send members of their student CEC chapter to next year's convention, she told me. I then asked what would happen with any excess funds. She said, "Oh, we give parties for handicapped kids." I replied, "That's nice. Tell me about it." She said, "Yeah, we give parties for MR kids, LD kids...."

This anecdote illustrates one of the problems facing us when we advocate noncategorical approaches to the education of students with mild disabilities. Namely, attitudes that interfere with our efforts. Regardless of how we may intellectualize about the evils of labeling, most of us have grown up being exposed to labels and using them naturally as part of our everyday conversations. Consequently, the inclinations to label are strong and quite difficult to change.

In this presentation I offer my perceptions on some of the issues, problems, and promises of noncategorical special education teacher preparation. These perceptions have evolved as a result of my experiences over the past 12 years. Among them have been a three-year stint as a member of a state-wide committee to develop noncategorical certification standards and membership in a University faculty that has been committed to developing a noncategorical teacher-education program.

To deal with a number of the specifics of teacher education in a practical context, I shall give you some examples of approaches that we at the University of Kentucky have attempted to eliminate or at least reduce some categorical approaches that are so prevalent in special education teacher preparation. At the same time, I shall try to sprinkle my remarks with some theory and perhaps respond to some questions that were raised in other presentations.

Dr. Blackhurst is Professor of Special Education, University of Kentucky.

Approximating a Noncategorical Approach in a Categorical System

Most special education university faculty members are supportive of non-categorical approaches to teacher education. However, many express puzzlement over how to carry out such programs when state certification standards are categorical. Categorical programs generally require students to take courses in "characteristics of..." and "methods of teaching..." (name your category). Such requirements definitely militate against a noncategorical approach. There are ways to get around these requirements, however. Here is how we approached the problem.

In 1970, three of my colleagues and I were given the responsibility for teaching special education methods courses. I was assigned the course dealing with methods of teaching the educable mentally retarded and the others were assigned the areas of emotional disturbance, learning disabilities, and orthopedically handicapped. In developing our courses we shared information on the contents with each other. We found a number of commonalities. For example, each of us had included units on writing instructional objectives, classroom management, and techniques for language development; in fact, we identified 13 common areas.

It occurred to us that we were wasting valuable resources because of this redundancy. Consequently, we developed what we called our "joint methods course." We divided the 13 common areas among ourselves and agreed upon a common format for the instruction we would deliver. We then developed the contents of our own presentations and submitted them to each other for recommendations and approval.

We were able to schedule all four courses at the same time, one in a large lecture hall. After the first class meeting, we required all students to meet for "joint" sessions for the presentation of the common content. Each unit required one or two joint sessions. They were followed by individual sessions at the next class meeting time during which students broke into their categorical groupings to discuss applications of the common content to their particular disability groups. (At that time, for example, we believed that only students in the area of orthopedically handicapped needed instruction on transfer and lifting; this content is now included for all our students because it is not uncommon to find children in wheelchairs in all types of special education classes.) For details on this approximation to a non-categorical approach, see Blackhurst, Cross, Nelson, and Tawney (1973).

In evaluating the joint methods course, we found that 88% of the students favored its continuation. Consequently, we continued the approach for the next five years. We collected many other formative evaluation data over the years. A summative evaluation also was performed; it yielded support for the course's effectiveness and also documented a number of problems that were associated with the format (Nelson, Berdine, & Moyer, 1978).

The reason for bringing up this decade-old approach is that some people question how you can operate a noncategorical program in a state with categorical certification requirements. This is one way to do it. Students are able to obtain a categorical course for their transcript because they enroll in a "methods of teaching the..." course. However, we manipulated the curriculum internally to approximate the noncategorical approach which we believed was more appropriate, conceptually.

A number of spin-off benefits occurred which we did not initially anticipate. The team approach, we found, capitalized on faculty strengths. That is, we were able to apply our individual specialties (e.g., behavioral management, reading instruction, instructional materials, and assessment). We also upgraded our own skills because each of us attended all sessions of the course. Thus, we were able to learn from each other. (In fact, two of us took the course off campus and taught from the materials developed by our colleagues.) We also found that the format that we had devised by trial and error coincided almost exactly with the formats that were being advocated by educators who were interested in the emerging process of competency-based instruction. Consequently, we were able to identify with this instructional movement and readily adapt to requirements of the federal funding agencies that began to require proposals focusing upon competency-based approaches to teacher education.

In the event that you are interested in considering our joint methods format, you should be aware of some of its potential problems. Initial planning time is significant. In addition to individual planning, we spent approximately 35 hours as a group reviewing the content and materials plus two hours per group developing assessment measures for each module.

Faculty members also must be prepared to share their complete lesson plans with colleagues for planning purposes. Some individuals may be reluctant to share, which can create problems.

Because each instructor covers his or her own specialty area, there is a tendency to cover too much material. In addition, some students expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of assessment that was required; we assessed each of the 13 modules.

It is important that the course be fully developed before offering it in this type of format. We had some problems with modules that were not complete before the course was started. This caveat also holds true for the development of student materials. Criteria for grading also must be developed and agreed upon in advance. We had some problems with inconsistency in interpretation across sections of the course, partly because of nonvalidated test items, but this problem disappeared over the years.

We concluded that the joint methods course was a workable approach to the noncategorical teacher-education issue in a categorical system. It remains workable today and I recommend that teacher educators in categorical

programs examine it if they are interested in approximating a noncategorical program.

Changing State Certification Requirements

At about the same time that we were offering the joint methods course, a number of people in Kentucky were lobbying for changes in state certification standards. We were able to get the Office of Teacher Certification to set up a committee to study the existing categorical certification requirements. This committee elected to pursue a noncategorical approach to the certification of teachers of mildly handicapped children.

In reaching this decision, the committee studied the rationale for noncategorical teacher education which was expounded by Smith and Neisworth (1975):

1. Categories are educationally irrelevant.

Knowing the categories provides little helpful information for teachers. They approach the teaching of a given topic the same way, regardless of the diagnostic label applied to a given child.

2. Categorical groupings overlap.

Students exhibit a range of behaviors that do not fit neatly into one specific category. It is not uncommon for children with the same characteristics to receive different diagnostic labels.

3. Categories label children as defective.

When children are labeled, people draw the implication that the problem rests with the child. The result is stereotyping and the development of negative expectations for the children's capabilities.

I asked my 13-year-old daughter, who is in eighth grade, about the latest slang that is going around in her school. (As you know, junior high students can be absolute beasts in their interactions with kids who don't "fit in.") She said that the latest slur is to call someone a "scumbag"; and there are "wimps." I asked her what was the worst thing you can call a kid and she said, "A retard." If the kids think that this is one of the worst things to be called, can you imagine their reactions when we adults formally label a student "retarded" and place him or her in a special class? It is no wonder that the students placed in such programs want to keep their classroom doors shut so they can "hide" from the other students.

4. Special education instructional materials are not category-specific.

Captioned films, braille, large-type readers, and other aids are designed for particular categories of exceptional children. Other materials (e.g., Peabody Language Development Kits) can be used with all categories of exceptional children. Most instructional materials fall into this latter category.

5. Categorical preparation leads to redundancy in coursework and barriers within the profession.

I have described some of the problems associated with overlap in

categorical methods courses. Although communication may be facilitated within groups that have categorical orientations, barriers also are erected that militate against communication. I am quite concerned, for example, with some of the categorical divisions within CEC. I prefer that greater emphasis be placed on divisions that are organized around functional areas with relevance for several categories (e.g., technology, parent involvement). I have chosen to become most active in the Teacher Education Division of CEC because it does not have the categorical orientation of some of the other divisions. It seems somewhat hypocritical to me that our professional organization decries labeling and, at the same time, supports categorical organization patterns.

6. Patterns of funding have perpetuated categorical approaches.

Local, state, and federal funding patterns largely follow categorical lines. As a consequence, many university teacher-education programs are organized around categories as well. Wouldn't it be great if we could operate our school programs on the basis of the services children need rather than the diagnostic category in which they have been placed? Thus, if a child needs individual tutoring in reading for three months, we could provide it without going through the process of labeling.

After reaching agreement on these basic principles, our certification committee worked for approximately three years to revise the certification standards. We abolished the certification programs for Educable Mentally Retarded, Emotionally Disturbed, Neurologically Impaired (Learning Disabilities), and Orthopedically Handicapped. They were replaced by a new certification called "Teacher of Children with Learning and Behavior Disorders." (There was considerable discussion about what to call this certificate and many of us are dissatisfied with this label as well.)

After this new certification was drafted it was widely circulated. It was sent to all school districts, professional organizations, colleges and universities, and parent groups in the state for comment. A series of public hearings was held to receive comments on the proposed requirements and they were widely discussed by the State Council on Teacher Education and Certification and the State Board of Education. Following much deliberation and a few revisions, the standards were adopted. They went into effect in 1978. Students working on the old categorical certifications had until 1981 to complete those requirements; anyone entering a teacher-education program in the area of mild disabilities after 1978 would work toward the new certificate.

At the same time, we revised the other certification requirements; we strengthened the categorical requirements that remained in the area of vision, hearing, and speech pathology. In addition, new certificates were developed for severely/profoundly handicapped, special education teacher consultant, special education diagnostician, and director of special education. The last three were designed to provide career ladder opportunities for teachers at the post-master's degree level who worked for increases in teacher and salary rank.

A Sample Noncategorical Teacher-Education Curriculum

It should be noted that a transition from categorical to noncategorical teacher-education curricula is not just a collapsing of the old categorical programs; rather, we are talking about a revision that is based upon the functions and competencies that are required to work with a variety of children who have been assigned a number of diagnostic labels. For example, in our old categorical certification programs the following pattern of 18 credit hours of coursework was typical:

- Introduction to Special Education
- Characteristics of
- Methods of Teaching
- Observation and Practicum
- Student Teaching in

Our revised curriculum for teachers of children with learning and behavior disorders consists of the following configuration (credit hours are in parentheses):

- Introduction to Special Education (4)
- Early Childhood Education of the Handicapped (2)
- Protecting the Human Rights of the Handicapped (2)
- Special Education Learning Environments (2)
- Speech and Language Development (3)
- Language Disorders (3)
- Career Education in Special Education (2)
- Behavioral Management of Exceptional Children (2)
- Prosthetics for Handicapped Children (2)
- Working with Parents of the Handicapped (2)
- Introduction to Instructional Media (1)
- Educational Assessment of the Mildly Handicapped (3)
- Educational Programming for the Mildly Handicapped (3)
- Field Experiences with Mildly Handicapped Children (3)
- Student Teaching in Special Education (6)

Both programs are also coupled with certification in elementary education. It should be evident from the course titles alone and the number of credits required that the revised program is quite different from the old, traditional program. Recently, due to budget reductions that resulted in the loss of staff members, it became necessary to modify the new curriculum. The courses on human rights and parents were combined, as were the courses on learning environment and behavioral management. They were made into 3-credit courses. One speech course was dropped and the other two-credit courses were expanded into three-credit courses. A module on computer literacy was also added to the instructional media course.

It should be emphasized that a curriculum revision of this magnitude is not easy. We developed a model to guide our efforts (Blackhurst, 1977). In

addition, we identified more than 60 issues which we had to confront and deal with during the curriculum-revision process (Blackhurst, McLoughlin, & Price, 1977). The entire process took a little over a year to complete and another one and one-half semesters to get approved by the various university committees that deal with curriculum revision.

The Status of Noncategorical Teacher Certification

The number of states that currently require noncategorical teacher certification is not clear. To my knowledge, only two studies relating to this topic have been conducted (Barresi & Bunte, 1979; Gilmore & Argyros, 1977). Although a few conclusions in these studies conflict, it is probably safe to conclude that at least 20 states have modified their certification requirements to require noncategorical certification or are moving in this direction. (This figure may be a bit low.)

The number of colleges and universities that offer noncategorical teacher-preparation programs is not known. It is probably safe to assume, however, that the universities in the states that require noncategorical certification offer such programs in order to obtain state approval of their curriculum.

Problems in Need of Resolution

In conducting noncategorical teacher-preparation programs, a number of problems need to be faced and resolved. They are briefly described below but are addressed in greater detail in Blackhurst (1981).

Certification Standards

Although many states are moving toward noncategorical certification, clearly there are many different interpretations of the nature of such certification standards. For example, New Mexico has a generic special education certificate; Massachusetts has two certificates in sensory areas and three classified by severity of handicap; and Tennessee has yet another pattern. Some states require regular certification along with special education whereas others have a single special education certificate. Some states also include categories in their generic certificate that other states do not (e.g., orthopedically handicapped and trainable mentally retarded).

Obviously, such discrepancies provide massive headaches for state certification officials who must deal with reciprocal certification for people who move into their states with a generic certification from another state. This problem is being addressed by signators to the interstate certification compact (Mackey, 1980).

Curriculum Design

The problem of revising teacher-preparation curricula already has been addressed. There follow just a few of the questions that faculty members must

resolve in designing noncategorical curricula. They are organized around the seven major steps that should be pursued in a curriculum-revision project (for details, see Blackhurst et al., 1977).

Mission Development. Who are we going to educate and for what purposes? What are the basic assumptions that underlie the program? Are there differences in expectations for different degree levels? What position should be taken on the various types of instructional delivery systems? Are there philosophical differences among faculty? If so, how should they be resolved?

Teaching Functions. What functions must graduates of the program be able to perform? Do these functions (e.g., assessment, programing, working with parents) differ according to educational setting? How do age differences of children affect these functions? How do the teaching functions relate to state certification requirements?

Teacher Competencies. What competencies are associated with each teaching function? Are any differences in competencies required because of the diagnostic label of the child? How should competencies be identified? What is their validity? How should they be stated?

Instructional Objectives. What objectives should be included? How should they be evaluated? What criterion levels should be set for acceptable performance?

Content. What content should be included in the curriculum? Inasmuch as many texts have a categorical orientation, how does one deal with them? Should categorical terminology be discouraged? If so, what replaces it? What relative emphasis should be placed on the various types of content?

Program Structure. How should the program be structured in terms of courses and practicum? What should be the nature of the courses? How should experiences be sequenced? How does one deal with practicum facilities that are still operated on a categorical basis? How does one re-educate categorical faculty?

Evaluation. What formative and summative evaluation questions should be addressed? Are students meeting objectives? Is the program effective? How does the field respond to the program?

It should be obvious that many questions and issues must be dealt with. One further complication is the students who are currently enrolled in categorical programs. A decision must be made on how to deal with them. It may be necessary to operate two programs until currently enrolled students have completed their course requirements.

Staffing

Noncategorical teacher-preparation programs affect staffing patterns, also. Faculty members often may be asked to assume new roles and teaching responsibilities for which they are often unprepared; consequently, there is a need for inservice education and faculty retraining.

Recruitment of faculty is also a matter of concern. I encountered a colleague at the CEC convention who was recruiting for his university. He indicated that he represented a noncategorical training program. I inquired about the qualifications for the new faculty member and he replied that they were looking for someone in the area of behavior disorders. That struck me as rather odd, particularly since he went on to explain that his university used categorical specialists to train noncategorical teachers. I suppose that this is one way to proceed; however, I prefer to see specialists being trained at the doctoral level to teach in noncategorical teacher-education programs. Again, these people would have specialties that relate to certain teaching functions (e.g., assessment, reading instruction) as opposed to categorical specialties. Unfortunately, I perceive that many doctoral programs are still operated on a categorical basis.

Practicum Arrangements

Previously, I alluded to the problem of practicum placements. Many schools are still operated on a categorical basis and they do not provide appropriate models for our students.

I recall visiting a school a few years ago and discussing practicum sites with the principal. He indicated that they had "an EMR resource room and an LD resource room." The reason, he went on to explain, was that the state funded programs on a categorical basis and he had to hire teachers with categorical certificates. That sounded like a reasonable explanation until I observed the two programs and discovered that the students in the EMR resource room were predominantly black whereas those in the LD resource room were white. Needless to say, we did not use his school for practicum purposes.

We gradually are seeing a reduction of this type of abuse; however, it still exists in some places. In Kentucky, we are finding that school administrators are becoming more flexible in the organization of their special education programs and in the placement of students in them. This change is due to the fact that more and more teachers with noncategorical certificates are becoming available for employment.

The Benefits of Noncategorical Teacher Preparation

The bottom line for noncategorical teacher preparation is, of course, improved instruction for students with mild disabilities. A number of related benefits also can be cited.

Updated Certification Standards

Committees and study groups that deal with special education certification are generating standards that are more comprehensive and have greater validity than those that were developed when special education was still in its infancy.

Because of the problem of interstate reciprocity, it will be interesting to see whether national standards or licensure (such as that offered by the American Speech and Hearing Association for speech pathologists and audiologists) emerges. Many people are opposed to this procedure although a number of other professionals support it. Heller (1982) has written a very provocative article in support of national standards. CEC currently is studying this topic.

Better Prepared Teachers

I noted earlier that noncategorical curricula should be more than a mere collapsing of the old categorical programs. Assuming that there is validity to both the certification requirements that dictate program components and the resulting curriculum, the teachers who are educated in such programs should be much better prepared to teach the diverse children that they will encounter.

We are beginning to see evidence to support this claim. Our initial follow-up studies indicate that our graduates from the new programs are better qualified and appear to be doing a better job than their counterparts who graduated with categorical certificates.

Improved Service Delivery

School administrators are quite enthusiastic about noncategorical special educators because the latter have greater flexibility. For example, a small rural district that might have only a few students who have been diagnosed as mildly retarded, mildly disturbed, or mildly learning disabled either would have had to hire several teachers with the appropriate certifications or try to find a special educator with multiple certificates. Now, the district can employ a single teacher with a noncategorical certificate.

The potential benefit that I am most excited about is the possibility of grouping students on the basis of instructionally relevant variables rather than diagnostic categories. Thus, the EMR resource room and LD resource room should disappear. Even though funding is still on a categorical basis in our state, school administrators have the option of requesting funds for a "variation plan." Such plans can assign noncategorical teachers to resource rooms that serve students with different characteristics. We are finding more and more of such arrangements as more teachers become available.

Reduction of Stereotyping

Categorical approaches contribute to and reinforce stereotyping. For example, last year I was on an accreditation visit to a junior high school. In the official school handbook, the teachers were listed as "Miss Jones, 8th Grade Social Studies"; "Mr. Smith, 7th Grade Science"; etc. At the end of the list were "Mrs. Green, EMR Teacher"; "Mr. Johnson, LD Teacher"; and several other special education personnel. I was informed by a teacher that a parent

wanted to know what the initials meant at the first PTA meeting. She was informed that EMR meant educable mentally retarded. No wonder the students want to hide! (Remember the earlier comments about "retards"?)

One of our major recommendations was that these designations be removed from the student handbook. However, the handbook I saw this year still contained the same information. This is the same school in which the special education students are referred to as "Eddy's" by the other students. A few years ago, the special education programs were moved to portable classrooms behind the school. This area was then referred to as "Eddyville" by the students in the school. Anyone familiar with Kentucky, will recognize "Eddyville" as the name of the state's maximum security prison.

I wish I knew how to deal with such situations. I may be naive but I hope that noncategorical teachers may help to reduce these stereotypes. I have a vision that the "EMR Teacher" or the "teacher who works with those crazy kids" will become known as the "special education teacher" or the "resource teacher" who is able to help any student who may be having difficulties in school, regardless of the diagnostic label that has been applied. Would it be too much to hope that such a teacher will be viewed truly as a resource in schools for any student, whether that student is assigned to special education?

Conclusions

I have presented my perceptions of and biases toward noncategorical special education teacher preparation. Obviously, I am in favor of such an approach to both teacher education and special education service delivery. We have been attempting to approximate this type of program for over a decade now, and the data that we have collected to date confirm our opinions that we are on the right track.

It is clear that changes from categorical to noncategorical teacher-education programs are difficult and require a major commitment by faculty members. However, I believe that such changes will pay rich dividends in the quality of our special education programs and are well worth the effort required to implement them.

References

- Barroff, J., & Bunte, J. Special education practices: A summary of a national survey. Paper prepared for the Policy Options Project. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1979.
- Blackhurst, A. E. Competency-based special education personnel preparation. In R. D. Kneidler & S. G. Tarver (Eds.), Changing perspectives in special education. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1977.
- Blackhurst, A. E. Noncategorical teacher preparation: Problems and promises.

- Exceptional Children, 1981, 48, 197-205.
- Blackhurst, A. E., Cross, D. P., Nelson, C. M., & Tawney, J. W. Approximating noncategorical teacher education. Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 284-288.
- Blackhurst, A. E., McLoughlin, J. A., & Price, L. M. Issues in the development of programs to prepare teachers of children with learning and behavior disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 1977, 2, 157-168.
- Gilmore, J. T., & Argyros, N. S. Special education certification: A state of the art survey. Albany, NY: State Education Department Office for the Education of Children with Handicapping Conditions, 1977.
- Heller, H. W. Professional standards for preparing special educators: Status and prospects. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 1982, 2, 77-86.
- Mackey, C. C., Jr. Interstate certification and special education. Teacher Education and Special Education, 1980, 2, 20-26.
- Nelson, D. M., Berdine, W. H., & Moyer, J. R. The evolution of a non-categorical competency-based special education methods course. Journal of Special Education Technology, 1978, 2, 37-46.
- Smith, R. M., & Neisworth, J. T. The exceptional child: A functional approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.